New Aspects of Religion in Ancient Athens

Religions in the Graeco-Roman World

Series Editors

David Frankfurter (*Boston University*)
Johannes Hahn (*Universität Münster*)
Frits G. Naerebout (*University of Leiden*)

VOLUME 183

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/rgrw*

New Aspects of Religion in Ancient Athens

Honors, Authorities, Esthetics, and Society

By

Jon D. Mikalson

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: *Inscriptiones Graecae* II/2 776. Photo courtesy of the Center for Epigraphical and Palaeographical Studies, The Ohio State University, USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Mikalson, Jon D., 1943– author.
Title: New aspects of religion in ancient Athens : honors, authorities, esthetics, and society / by Jon D. Mikalson.
Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2016. | Series: Religions in the Graeco-Roman world, ISSN 0927-7633 ; volume 183 | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2016023633 (print) | LCCN 2016024423 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004319189 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9789004319196 (E-book)
Subjects: LCSH: Athens (Greece)—Religion.
Classification: LCC BL793.A76 M545 2016 (print) | LCC BL793.A76 (ebook) | DDC 292.080938/5—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2016023633

Want or need Open Access? Brill Open offers you the choice to make your research freely accessible online in exchange for a publication charge. Review your various options on brill.com/brill-open.

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0927-7633
ISBN 978-90-04-31918-9 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-31919-6 (e-book)

Copyright 2016 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπό τινος, τίνι οἱ φιλόπονοι τῶν ῥᾳθύμων διαφέρουσι,
εἶπεν
ὡς οἱ εὐσεβεῖς τῶν ἀσεβῶν, ἐλπίσιν ἀγαθαῖς.

Isocrates, when asked by someone in what the
hard working differ from the lazy,
said,
As those who show respect for the gods differ from those who don't,
in their good hopes for the future.

Isocrates, fragment 20

ταῦτα δὲ διανοηθεὶς ἔγραφον τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, οὐκ ἀκμάζων ἀλλ᾽ ἔτη γεγονὼς δύο καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα. διόπερ χρὴ συγγνώμην ἔχειν ἢν μαλακώτερος ὢν φαίνηται τῶν παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ πρότερον ἐκδεδομένων. καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ῥᾴδιος ἦν οὐδ᾽ ἁπλοῦς, ἀλλὰ πολλὴν ἔχων πραγματείαν. . . . πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῶν ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ πάλαι γεγραμμένων ἐγκαταμεμιγμένα τοῖς νῦν λεγομένοις οὐκ ἀλόγως οὐδ᾽ ἀκαίρως, ἀλλὰ προσηκόντως τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις.

Isocrates, 15.10 with ἑβδομήκοντα for ὀγκοήκοντα

After having thought about these things, I was writing this book when I was not in my prime but seventy-two years old. Therefore you ought to have some sympathy if it appears a little "softer" than my previous publications. The book was neither easy nor simple but involved a lot of time and effort. . . . Many of the things that were written by me long ago have been mixed in with what is now said, not unreasonably nor inappropriately but in way befitting the topics.

⁘

Contents

Preface ix
Abbreviations x

Introduction 1

PART 1
Approbation

1 **The Qualifiers of Athenian Religious Practices** 19

2 **The Good Priests and Priestesses** 50

3 **Who Sacrifices and to Whom?** 56

4 **Who Reports What?** 84

5 **Who Pays for What?** 91

PART 2
Authority

Introduction to Part 2 109

6 **Τὰ Πάτρια** 110

7 ***Nomoi* and *Psephismata*** 120

8 **Oracles and Divination** 154

9 **The Four Authorities** 165

PART 3
Approbation and Authority

10 ***The Rhetoric to Alexander*** 185

11 **Authority of the Polis** 189

12 **Approbation** 242

13 **Social and Esthetic Dimensions of Religious Actions** 249

Appendices

1 **The Oracles of Demosthenes 43 and 21** 267
2 **Demosthenes, *Prooemium* 54** 276
3 **Ἱερὰ Καλά** 279
4 **Ὁσιότης** 283
5 **Curse Tablets from Cnidus and Ὁσιότης** 292
6 **Some Non-Athenian Praises of Religious Actions** 294
7 **Athens and the Cult of Eleusinian Demeter** 296

Glossary of Greek Terms 301
Glossary of Officials and Terms 303
Bibliography 307
Index of Inscriptions Cited 317
Index of Other Texts Cited 326
Index of Greek Phrases 334
General Index 335

Preface

After spending a few years on questions about εὐσέβεια ("proper respect") and ὁσιότης ("religious correctness") in ancient Greek religion, now published in *Popular Greek Religion in Greek Philosophy*, I decided, one afternoon, to see how ὁσιότης and its cognates, so common in literary and philosophical texts, were used in Athenian epigraphical texts. The search took very little time—mere seconds, in fact. It turned out that ὁσιότης and its cognates are quite rare and late on Athenian inscriptions. No person is designated as ὅσιος, and no person is praised for acting ὁσίως. Given the frequency and importance of these terms in philosophical and literary texts, that seemed odd, and it enticed me to investigate a rather wide range of religious terms and their contexts in Athenian inscriptions and led to the results in this book. And ὁσιότης became a mere Appendix.

This study and this book would have been impossible without the on-line *Searchable Greek Inscriptions*, centered at Cornell University and Ohio State University and hosted by The Packard Humanities Institute, without the on-line Brill *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, and without the on-line *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* of the University of California, Irvine. For all three I express my deep gratitude to those many who have labored and contributed to create, update, and maintain these precious resources. They can be fully appreciated perhaps only by those who remember their excitement at the invention of the Ibycus by David W. Packard.

As my work drew to a close, I benefited greatly from careful readings of the whole or parts of my manuscript by my colleague Elizabeth Meyer and by Angelos Chaniotis, Christopher Faraone, Robert Garland, Edward Harris, and an anonymous reader. They had many suggestions and corrections to offer, and the book was much improved. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Henk Versnel who saw value in the project, encouraged me in it, and promoted its publication. And finally I express my gratitude to Frits Naerebout, Maarten Frieswijk, and Stephanie Paalvast, who accepted the manuscript for the Brill series *Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* and have seen it through to publication.

In 1975 I dedicated my first book to my dear wife Mary, then as now the *sine qua non* of my life and work, and now I dedicate this book to her, in deepest affection and gratitude for fifty years of marital happiness and of copy-editing, proof-reading, and indexing.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations for periodicals are those listed in *The American Journal of Archaeology* 95 (1991), 1–16. The following abbreviations for primarily epigraphical publications are largely taken from *SEG* and from McLean, 2002.387–472. Fuller bibliographic material for all epigraphical entries may be found there.

Agora 15	B. D. Meritt and J. S. Trail, *The Athenian Councillors* (*The Athenian Agora* XV), Princeton, 1974
Agora 16	A. G. Woodhead, *Inscriptions: The Decrees* (*The Athenian Agora* XVI), Princeton, 1974
Agora 18	D. J. Geagan, *Inscriptions: The Dedications* (*The Athenian Agora* XVIII), Princeton, 2011
Aleshire	S. B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, their Dedications, and the Inventories*, Amsterdam, 1989
Aneziri	S. Aneziri, *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft*, Wiesbaden, 2003
CEG	P. A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1983–1989
CID	*Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes*, Paris, 1978–
FD 3	*Fouilles de Delphes III: Épigraphie*, Paris, 1929–1976
Hesp.	*Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Cambridge, Mass. and Princeton
I. Beroia	L. Gounaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Ἐπιγραφὲς Βεροίας*, Athens, 1998
I. Cos	M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos*, Rome, 1993
I. Délos	*Inscriptions de Délos*, Paris, 1926–1972
I. Didyma	R. Rehm, *Didyma II: Die Inschriften*, Berlin, 1958
I. Eleusis	K. Clinton, *Eleusis: The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme*, Athens, 2005 and 2008
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin, 1893–
I. Hierapolis	W. Judeich, "Inschriften," pp. 67–202 in *Altertümer von Hierapolis*, ed. C. Humann and others, Berlin, 1898
I. Iasos	W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos*, Bonn, 1985
I. Knidos	W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Knidos*, Bonn, 1992
I. Labraunda	J. Crampa, *Labraunda: Swedish Excavations and Researches, vol. III. Greek Inscriptions*, Lund and Stockholm, 1969–1972

I. Lindos	Ch. Blinkenberg, *Lindos: Fouilles de l'Acropole, Inscriptions*, Copenhagen, 1941
I. Magnesia	O. Kern, *Die Inscriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin, 1900
IMT	M. Barth and J. Stauber, *Inschriften von Mysia und Troas: Skamander und Nebentälerer*, Munich, 1993
I. Mylasa	W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Mylasa*, Bonn, 1987–1988
I. Oropos	V. C. Petrakos, *Οἱ ἐπιγραφές τοῦ ᾽Ωρωποῦ*, Athens, 1997
I. Patmos	D. F. McCabe and M. A. Plunkett, *Patmos Inscriptions: Texts and List*, Princeton, 1985
I. Pergamon	M. Fraenkel, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*, Berlin, 1890–1895
I. Priene^2	W. Blümel and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Priene*, Bonn, 2014
I. Prose	A. Bernand, *La prose sur pierre dans l'Égypt hellénistique et romaine*, Paris, 1992
I. Rhamnous	B. Petrakos, *῾Ο Δῆμος τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος*, Athens, 1969
I. Rhod. Peraia	A. Bresson, *Recueil des inscriptions de la Pérée rhodienne*, Paris, 1991
I. Sardis	W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson, *Sardis VII: Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, Leiden, 1932
I. Sestos	J. Krauss, *Die Inschriften von Sestos und der thrakischen Chersones*, Bonn, 1980
I. Sinuri	L. Robert, *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa*, vol. 1, Paris, 1945
I. Smyrna	G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*, Bonn, 1982–1990
I. Stratonikeia	M. Ç. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia*, Bonn, 1981–1990
IvO	W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold, *Inschriften von Olympia*, Berlin, 1896
M&L	R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1969
MAMA	*Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, I–X, London, 1928–1993
MDAI	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*, Berlin
R&O	P. J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 B.C.*, Oxford, 2003
RC	C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, New Haven, 1934 (reprinted 1974)
Rigsby	K. J. Rigsby, *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1996

Schwenk	C. J. Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander*, Chicago, 1985
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
SGDI	H. Collitz and F. Bechtel, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, Göttingen, 1884–1915
Sylloge^{3}	W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1915–1924
TAM	*Tituli Asiae Minoris*, Wien, 1901–1989

Introduction

Hundreds of Athenian inscriptions from the Hellenistic period honor for their religious activities priests and priestesses, lay religious officials, administrative and legislative officials, military officers, and various other governmental and private individuals. In ways that we do not find elsewhere these texts describe and, more importantly, characterize fundamental religious actions such as sacrifice, prayer, the taking of omens, sponsorship of *agones* at *heortai*, supervision of sanctuaries and of various religious activities, and the performance of numerous other religious duties. They indicate not only what was done but often the manner in which these acts were done. They provide, as it were, some adverbs to the verbs and some adjectives to the nouns of Greek religious practice. What is it to sacrifice well? What makes a religious *pompe* good? Such questions are, in themselves, important, and they will lead us into new areas of study, including the social and esthetic aspects of Greek religious practices such as sacrifice and the other elements of *heortai*. These texts also indicate, far more often than the literary texts, the authorities on the basis of which religious acts were performed, whether they be ancestral custom, laws, decrees, or oracles, and all this helps to explain why the Athenians did what they did in religion. Literary texts tend to emphasize the personal and familial sides of religious actions, but these epigraphical texts, more consistently and perhaps better than any other source, put these religious actions into a larger social and political context, whether of the polis, the tribe, the deme, or a variety of private associations. And, finally, they supplement the information we gather from elsewhere on the interaction of the Athenian polis and the hundreds, indeed thousands, of public and private religious cults of Athens.[1] Did the polis, as often claimed, closely control the religious activities of priests, priestesses, and individual worshippers? "Approbation" (Part 1) will lead, I trust, to a better understanding of "Authority" (Part 2) in Athenian practiced religion.

1 For this study I heartily endorse the principles and methodology laid out by David Whitehead, 1993, especially the primary emphasis on the epigraphical material and the careful discussion of the relationship of that to prior and contemporary literary sources. Noteworthy here is Whitehead's claim (p. 42), with only one word changed, that "by commending and rewarding some attributes rather than others, and by doing so over and over again, these documents [i.e., inscriptions] delineate for us as no other kind of evidence so emphatically can the cardinal virtues of Athenian *religion* (my *religion* for his *democracy*)."

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_002

Part 1 Approbation

The Athenians through their national organizations, the Boule and Ekklesia, and through their demes, tribes, *gene*, and other such units formally honored fellow citizens for a wide variety of religious acts and contributions. In the commendations inscribed on *stelai* they usually added to a simple description of the action one or more adverbs, adjectives, or phrases to indicate the manner in which the action was done, and sometimes to make clear the purpose of the action. These qualifiers are for the most part formulaic, but they do indicate some important aspects of how Athenians wanted, e.g., sacrifices to be made, *heortai* to be held, *pompai* to be performed, and sanctuaries to be tended.

In Chapter 1 we examine such qualifiers for sacrifices and for other elements of *heortai* such as *pannychides, pompai*, and *agones*. The property of deities, their sanctuaries and their dedications, also needed to be tended, and the manner in which the honorand did this is usually described. What emerges from these qualifying adverbs, adjectives, and phrases are social, moral, and, especially, esthetic aspects of these elements of Athenian religion. Priests and priestesses for polis cults, for deme cults, for other citizen cults, and for those of private associations have, in addition to sacrificing, various religious duties, and in Chapter 2 we survey in what terms they were praised for those, what makes a "good" priest or priestess. In Athens many besides priests and priestesses performed sacrifices, sometimes as an officer or member of a governmental unit, or of a *genos*, or of an association, and in Chapter 3 we examine who they were and in what terms they, too, were praised. A few priests and priestesses and a small number of officials routinely or occasionally reported to the Boule or another organization the results of their sacrifices, and in Chapter 4 we survey who made such reports and what, in fact, they were reporting. Most religious activities in Athens were funded by the polis or by funds generated by the individual cults, but occasionally, and over time increasingly, individuals contributed their own money. In Chapter 5 we look at who did contribute money, for what purposes, in which cults, and when, why, and in what terms they were praised.[2]

2 We do not treat in this Chapter or in this book the various ways the Athenian government funded or handled the funds for polis cults. That is an extremely complicated subject which itself would require a separate book.

Part 2 Authority

In terms of "authority" in Greek or Athenian religion one can concentrate on what authority various officials such as priests, government officials like the archon or basileus, lay boards such as the hieropoioi and epimeletai, and various others exercised, or on what authority the Ekklesia had vs. the Boule, the polis vs. the deme, the polis vs. the priests, and other such pairs. Useful evidence for this has been collected in Part 1, and we will draw some conclusions on these topics from that in Part 3, Approbation and Authority. In Part 2 we focus on what emerge as the four major determinants of religious actions, what authorities the Athenians claim when they are sacrificing or performing other religious actions. These are "the ancestral customs" (τὰ πάτρια) (Chapter 6), laws (*nomoi*) and decrees (*psephismata*), together and separately (Chapter 7), and oracles (Chapter 8). In Chapter 9 we put these four authorities together, and each will be found to have its own role in determining religious actions, with some intersection and interplay, and each will be found to have a specific place in what we may see as a hierarchy of authority.[3]

Part 3 Approbation and Authority

Chapter 10 opens Part 3 with a translation and discussion of the pseudo-Aristotelian, but still early *Rhetoric to Alexander*, which brings together much of what we have been describing, in terms of both approbation and authority. In Chapter 11 we examine the authority of the polis in religious matters, through the Ekklesia, Boule, administrative and military officials, committees, and the courts. In Chapter 12 we bring together thoughts about Approbation, the praises and honors Athenians gave to those who performed religious actions for them. This leads to Chapter 13, on social and esthetic dimensions of Athenian religious practices.

---

3 I was pleased to find that this type of investigation was recently recognized as a desideratum by A. Petrovic in the new *Oxford Handbook of Greek Religion* (2015.351): "What of the role of tradition, *ta patria*, and civic institutions? How do they formulate ritual norms? These questions, and many more, still await answers. But a first step in that direction might be to establish a clear taxonomy of the norms, by conducting an analysis of the attested types of authorities setting out cultic regulations. . . . If we gained a statistical overview of the extant 'sacred laws' by (epigraphic) genre, issuing authority, and content, we could start paving the way towards a fuller and more systematic understanding of the intricacies of Greek ritual life." This I hope to have done for Athens.

The structure of the individual chapters and of the book as a whole requires some clarification. In general terms in Chapters 1–8 the evidence is given first, and in Chapters 1–5 some conclusions from that evidence are given in each chapter. For Chapters 6 (Τὰ Πάτρια), 7 (*Nomoi* and *Psephismata*), and 8 (Oracles), only the evidence is given. The conclusions drawn from these three chapters form Chapter 9 (The Four Authorities). Chapters 11, 12, and 13 then draw together evidence and conclusions from all preceding chapters for more comprehensive discussion. The appendices address discrete points that seemed relevant but not central to the argument of the book.

The honorary texts at the heart of this study take many forms, but by way of introduction to them I offer one, a polis decree honoring Timocrite, priestess of Aglauros, daughter of Polynices, dated to 250/49 BC (*SEG* 33.115):

> In the archonship of Polyeuctus, in the second prytany, that of the tribe Erechtheis, for which Chaerephon the son of Archestratus was grammateus, on the eleventh of Metageitnion, on the eleventh day of the prytany, an ekklesia *kuria*. Of the presiding officers Cleidemus the son of Phrynon of the deme Phlya and his fellow presiding officers brought the vote. The following resolution was approved by the Boule and the Demos. Demostratus the son of Aristophanes of the deme Paiania proposed it. Concerning what Aristophanes the son of the priestess of Aglauros reports concerning the sacrificial animals (τὰ ἱερά) which she was sacrificing at the inaugural offerings (*eisiteteria*) to Aglauros, Ares, Helios, the Horai, Apollo, and the other gods to whom it was ancestral (πάτριον) (to sacrifice), with good fortune, it has been resolved by the Boule for the presiding officers who preside at the first meeting of the Ekklesia to deliberate about these things (in that part of the agenda devoted) to "sacred matters" (ἱερά), and to communicate to the Demos the opinion of the Boule that it seems right to the Boule for the Boule and Demos to accept the good things (τὰ ἀγαθά) that occurred in the sacrificial victims (ἱερά) for the health and safety (ἐφ' ὑγιείαι καὶ σωτηρίαι) of the Boule and the Demos of Athenians and their children and wives and for King Antigonus and Queen Phila and their descendents. And since the priestess of Aglauros sacrificed the inaugural sacrifices (*eisagogeia*) and the sacrifices "appropriate" to (προσήκουσαι) her, and she oversaw also the good order in the all-night festival (*pannychis*), and she adorned the table, it is resolved to praise the priestess of Aglauros, Timocrite, daughter of Polynices, whose deme is Aphidna, and to crown her with a crown of olive because of her proper respect (εὐσέβεια) towards the gods. And the grammateus for the prytany is to inscribe this decree on a stone

stele and to erect it in the sanctuary (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) of Aglauros, and for the inscription of the *stele* the officials overseeing the budget are to dispense the cost that has occurred.[4]

The Boule

The Demos

The priestess Timocrite

This rich and unusually complete text, excavated on the east slope of the Acropolis and first published in 1969, offers abundant material for study: the year and calendrical date, the procedures of the Boule and Ekklesia, the find spot of the inscription and the site of the sanctuary of Aglauros (which has major historical implications for the assault of the Persians on the Acropolis in 480 BC), the family of Timocrite, the role of a priestess, the inclusion of King Antigonus Gonatas and his wife, the *eisiteteria* and the ephebes for whom they were probably performed, and the divine recipients of the various sacrifices.[5] My interests in this book, however, are directed elsewhere.

In these texts priests, priestesses like Timocrite, and many other individuals and groups numerous times are praised εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας ("because of their proper respect and love of honor"). Timocrite is so praised, εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα, but why, we might ask, is there no mention of her φιλοτιμία? Sacrifices are regularly made, as here, ἐπὶ τῇ ὑγιείᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ or ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑγιείας καὶ σωτηρίας ("for the health and safety") of the Boule and the Demos and others. The Boule and Demos regularly "accept τὰ ἀγαθά ('the good things')" that were reported to them concerning these sacrifices. And there are certain sacrifices that are "appropriate" (καθήκουσαι, or, as here, προσήκουσαι) for certain officials. Not in Timocrite's decree, but very, very often elsewhere, the honorand is praised for sacrificing καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς ("beautifully and in manner showing proper respect") or καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ("beautifully and in a manner showing love of honor"). Remarkably, though, these highly formulaic phrases καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας, ἐπὶ τῇ ὑγιείᾳ καὶ

4 In this text and throughout the Introduction I use some translations for terms that will be argued for later.

5 On this text, see Mikalson, 1998.164–6; on find spot, Dontas, 1983; on family, Lambert, 2012.77 and 2012a.235; on Antigonus and on divine beneficiaries, Parker, 2005.434 n. 64 and Mikalson, 1998.160–66; and on the *eisiteteria* and *eisagogeia*, Chaniotis, 2005.45–6 and Parker, 2005.434 n. 64.

σωτηρίᾳ, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑγιείας καὶ σωτηρίας, θυσίαι καθηκοῦσαι, and the formula for accepting the reports of τὰ ἀγαθά occur nowhere else in the corpus of classical and Hellenistic Greek literature.[6] τὰ ἱερά are regularly reported in prose and poetic sources as being καλά ("beautiful"), but only in the inscriptions, with one special exception, are they reported as σωτήρια ("providing safety"). And the common purpose of sacrificial activity as given in the inscriptions, ὅπως ἂν ἔχῃ καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς . . . τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς ("so that the things relating to the gods may be beautiful and showing proper respect"),[7] and its slight variants, occurs only once, in the same exceptional source, in the prose literature.[8] All of this suggests that inscriptions like the Timocrite decree may be a unique source, another voice for the religious concepts and beliefs of their period and even of the earlier, classical period. If that is so, then we may also find in them and in other similar contemporary inscriptions valuable information about a number of religious matters: on what, for example, makes a good sacrifice or a good priest or priestess, what characterizes a good *heorte*, what are the prized religious behaviors, what individual authorities lie behind individual practices, in which cults and practices does the polis show an interest and oversight, who is sacrificing to whom, and who is paying the costs. These and similar matters, some of which arise in the Timocrite decree, are rarely if ever treated in the literary sources and therefore have not received much scholarly attention. Finally, the answers to the various religious questions suggested by these texts can then be compared to the much scantier discussions of them in the literary sources from both the classical and Hellenistic periods. Are these epigraphical texts merely making explicit some widely accepted but unexpressed concepts and beliefs of earlier times, or have there been some changes in outlook?

The number and formulaic character of many of these texts have limited the interest of religious scholars in their content.[9] Viewed negatively, the formulae associated with religious and other activities in texts like the Timocrite

---

6 For ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑγιείας καὶ σωτηρίας the closest parallels are the prayers in Ar. *Av*. 878–9, Is. 8.16, and Menander, *Kolax*, frag. 1. The last is that all the Olympian gods and goddesses διδόναι σωτηρίαν, ὑγίειαν, ἀγαθὰ πολλά, τῶν ὄντων τε νῦν ἀγαθῶν ὄνησιν πᾶσι, clearly not yet formulaic.

7 This serves to correct my translation of this phrase as "so that the relations to the gods may be good and pious," as in 1998.114. For reasons discussed above, neither "good" nor "pious" is correct.

8 For Demosthenes, *Prooemium* 54 being a pastiche of epigraphical formulae, see Appendix 1.

9 They are not, for example, included in the most recent (Taylor, 2015) description of the epigraphical materials contributing to the study of Greek religion. Apart from a survey Taylor offers a good summary of the current concerns with the theoretical problems (and possibilities) of using epigraphical material for understanding Greek religion.

decree could be thought "banal" and mere vestiges of once alive ideas, and could be passed over quickly, as, I admit, I have usually done.[10] Viewed positively, however, they reflect deep seated and fundamental religious concepts of the society and times in which they were used, formulaic because they were familiar and accepted by all.[11] Also, if we view these formulae positively, as I now wish to do, we can ask, which is rarely done, what they mean. It has not, for example, been systematically studied what it means to sacrifice καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς" or what are τὰ ἀγαθά that are being reported. What are, as another example, τὰ ἱερά that are καλά? What does καλά mean in this context? Also, if we view them positively, we can ask if these formulae are used randomly as it might superficially appear. Are all religious acts praised for being performed εὐσεβῶς, or only certain ones? Is it a throw-away phrase to say that the sacrifices were performed "according to ancestral customs" (κατὰ τὰ πάτρια), or "according to the laws" (κατὰ τοὺς νόμους), or were real distinctions being made? If so, what are they? And, if we take these formulae seriously, we can search for their antecedents in wording or in concept in earlier, classical times and ask if we are finding continuities or discontinuities from the classical to the Hellenistic period. Finally, these texts provide considerably more and new data for currently debated questions of the nature and extent of polis authority over the religious cults of Athens. I treat these texts not so much for their own sake, which would be worthwhile in itself, but as another source for better understanding popular, practiced Athenian religion of the time.

The general nature, formal aspects, and history of these "honorary" (or "honorific") inscriptions are well described in McLean, 2002.228–245. Veligianni-Terzi (1997) and Henry (1996 and 1983) offer valuable studies of their language and formulae. All who work with these texts are much indebted to Stephen Lambert who has reedited many of them for *IG* II^3 and has written

10 Hence arose various errors in my *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (1998), errors which I will note in the following pages.

11 Cf. Whitehead, 1983.60–1: "The language of Athenian honorific decrees—of the *boule* and *ekklesia*, of the demes and tribes, and of para-political organizations which copied official practice—is a subject which repays more attention than it is usually given. The temptation is to dismiss most of it as cliché: succinct, businesslike formulas (for the most part) in the fifth century, moving to ever more elaborate and verbose formulas in the fourth century and beyond. Yet *topoi*, by their very nature, embody valuable information." And, p. 68, "I have emphasised the rôle played in this by honorific decrees because, on this as on other topics, they are an oddly undervalued source of information and insight; certainly they have as much to offer the historian as he can learn, of the communal mentality, from many literary genres." For more of the same, see Whitehead, 1993. Cf. Mikalson, 1998.114.

careful and detailed studies concerning those and others, as the numerous references in my text and entries in the bibliography will attest. Some of these texts have been used for over a century to establish Athenian prosopography and chronology and to refine our knowledge of Athenian political and religious institutions. More recently they have come to the fore as a specific genre in studies of the general Athenian inclination, after mid-IV BC, to honor fellow citizens for a wide range of activities, as in Meyer, 2013, Lambert, 2011, Luraghi, 2010, Mikalson, 1998.310–11, and Hakkarainen, 1997.[12] The honorary inscriptions of the demes have been illuminated by Lasagna, 2004, Jones, 2004.78–85, and Whitehead, 1986. Arnaoutoglou (2003) offers valuable material on those of private associations. In terms of these texts themselves, I hope to offer improved understanding of the meaning and context of several of the Greek phrases and formulae associated with religious activities.

My colleague Elizabeth Meyer, an expert on the Athenian "epigraphical habit," has stressed to me some of the dangers in relying so heavily on inscriptions. The honorific inscriptions, *nomoi*, and *psephismata* are genres unto themselves, each with its own, sometimes changing habits of what to include and what not to include. Can we conclude that only what we find on these inscriptions was done or was considered praiseworthy in a religious context in Athenian society of the time? No, of course not. There is a vast amount we do not know. But for most of III, II, and I BC the inscriptions are pretty much all we have. I have searched out other sources and included them, but they are few. In defense of the inscriptions, however, I would point out that they are very numerous for all these periods, they are contemporary to what they describe, they treat a wide range of topics, they are remarkably consistent from the beginning to the end of my period, and, although they were edited and perhaps manipulated for a variety of purposes,[13] they are not subject to "poetic" elaboration.[14] When we have both literary and epigraphical sources, as for much of IV BC, the evidence from inscriptions also correlates remarkably well with what we find in the surviving writings, especially of the orators. I recognize that epigraphical conventions, frequency, and distribution could and sometimes did change over time, but these changes in the various genres of inscriptions have not yet been sufficiently determined to apply to this study.

12 For earlier studies see also Graf, 1995, Habicht, 1995, Whitehead, 1993, Hansen, 1987.114–15 and 123, and Gauthier, 1985.

13 See, e.g., Taylor, 2015, Meyer, 2013 and Osborne, 1999.

14 Here, perhaps, it is appropriate to recall the "habit" planted in K. J. Dover by R. Meiggs, "on any question in Greek history or the Greek language, go first to the inscriptions and only after that to literature" (Dover, 1994.59).

As a corollary to all this, arguments *ex silentio* (from what is *not* said or attested in our sources) are always dangerous, and I introduce them sparingly, but, to give one example, when we have five Delphic oracles on religious matters attested in epigraphical and literary sources from VI BC, ten from V BC, and six from IV BC, but none from III, II, or I BC,[15] is it more reasonable to conclude that the Athenians were, after IV BC rarely if ever consulting the Oracle on such matters, or that unidentified changing epigraphical habits meant that such consultations were no longer reported? In short, the surviving evidence offers far less than what we would like, but the inscriptions are what we have, and I hope to contribute to the effort to interpret them correctly.

In much broader terms I use these texts as an entrée point for investigating various topics about Athenian religion: who was sacrificing on behalf of the polis, who was paying the costs for religious activities, and what in these activities specifically was praised and in what terms. On the first question Parker (2005.89–104) has much of value and I hope to expand upon and refine his conclusions. On the second question, the consensus opinion has developed that, as we move through the Hellenistic period, the costs of polis cult were more and more being covered by wealthy individuals until virtually all costs were paid by them (Lambert, 2012, Hakkarainen, 1997, Parker, 1996.268–70). Priests (Naiden, 2013.216) and ephebes (Deshours, 2011.174, 177, and 310 and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.257–9), as examples, are claimed now themselves to be financing the sacrifices they performed. This would be a fundamental change in the nature of Athenian polis religion. I will question this consensus, largely by looking more carefully for explicit indications of individuals' financial contributions and by specifying which elements of polis (and other) religious activities they involved. The final questions, what was being praised and in what terms, have not been ventured in quite this form before, and I trust the investigation will contribute to our understanding of what was valued in religious activities in this period and for what reasons. From this investigation emerge two new aspects of public religion in Athens. Very recently Fred Naiden (2015, 2013) has noted the importance of "beauty" in sacrifice, and Angelos Chaniotis (2013) describes it for *pompai*. Through the honorific inscriptions and through other inscriptions and prose texts, I discovered that "beauty" was a desideratum and a laudandum for Athenian religion not only in sacrifices and *pompai* but virtually everywhere. When participants, sanctuaries, all elements of sacrifices, *heortai, pompai, pannychides*, and sanctuaries, altars, and dedications are described, there is a pervasive concern with their visual "beauty," and this esthetic is, I think, a significant new aspect of

15 See Chapters 10 and 11.

Greek religion.[16] I focus on the Athenian context, but it can be found throughout the Greek world, and due appreciation of that will require another book. In addition, a new social aspect of Greek religion emerges from these texts. In performing public religious actions, individuals were concerned to please *both* the gods *and* their peers and were praised simultaneously for both. This social dimension, pleasing one's peers, has not been marked out before as an element of Greek religious activity.

In three areas I deviate significantly from current trends in scholarship on Greek religion: in the emphasis on the "embeddedness" of religion in Athenian life; on the extent of polis control of religion within its borders; and on the devaluation of the individual polis as an object of study. It has become fashionable to claim that religion was "embedded" in all aspects of Athenian (or Greek) life.[17] I tend to doubt this claim, especially the "all" part. The Athenians clearly distinguished, in their terms, τὰ ἱερά from τὰ ὅσια, "the sacred" from "the profane,"[18] and, I would dare assert, it is precisely this distinction that allowed much of what we value, including tragedy, comedy, philosophy, and several of the democratic institutions to flourish in Athens. The Athenians and ancient Greeks in general were not as inhibited by restrictions arising from religion, by

16 Recent studies of "visuality" of rituals, *heortai*, statues, and such in Greek religion concern a quite different matter. They distinguish "religious visuality" from "esthetic visuality" (to use the terms of Kindt). They treat only superficially, if at all, the "esthetic visuality" in Greek religion, usually dismissing it as an "artistic experience" separate from the "religious experience." I have come to think of "esthetic visuality," too, as part of the "religious experience" as I will set out in Chapter 13. For current "visuality" approaches, see, e.g., Scheer, 2015 (on statuary, with extensive bibliography), Rutherford, 2013.142–8 (on *theoriai*), and Kindt, 2012, esp. 36–54 (on theory).

17 Since Robert Parker introduced the term "embedded" into the study of Greek religion (1986.295–6), it has thrived and appears in most general and many detailed studies of both Greek and Roman religion. And it has become a subject in its own right. Nongbri (2008) faults the idea of "embeddedness of religion" (particularly in Roman religion, but equally relevant to Greek religion) because it presumes that there was a distinct entity we, redistributively, call "religion." Eidenow (2015) faults the limitations on the term as employed by previous scholars for "whom there is little consideration of what we might call cognitive processes of transmission, reflection, and experience, or the co-creation of religious ritual." She offers a "new formulation of 'embeddedness' " which she expects "may lead to a reconceptualization of Greek religion." Parker limited the term initially to a social context, but others use it (as Bremmer, 1994.2–4 and Bonnechere in 2013.366–8) to suggest that religion permeated all aspects of Greek life, and it is in that sense that I question it.

18 On this use of these terms, see Appendix 4.

τὰ ἱερά, as have been so many other ancient and modern societies. Were there gods and goddesses, prayers and sacrifices in tragedy, comedy, and philosophy? Of course. And if we include under "religion" every mention of a god or a goddess or a prayer, then "religion" does permeate all Greek art and literature. But if we mean by "religion" the gods and goddesses and heroes for whom the Athenians built altars and sanctuaries and to whom they actually sacrificed and prayed, and the beliefs, rituals, and practices associated with these deities, the picture becomes quite different. The inscriptions and this book deal, much like my *Ancient Greek Religion*, only with the latter, perhaps limited, concept of "religion."

From the inscriptions and other sources I hope to draw indications of the degree to which and the areas in which the Athenian polis, as an institution, involved itself in the everyday religious life of its citizens and foreign residents. I investigate what "authority" the civil institutions and personnel had, and more importantly what "authority" they exercised, in intra-polis religious matters. Here I build upon the excellent studies of Robert Garland (1984 and 1990) and challenge those who since then have claimed a much wider involvement of polis "control" of religion within its boundaries (Sourvinou-Inwood, 1990.302, Rhodes, 2009.13, Horster, 2010.179).

Robert Parker (especially 1995 and 2005) has made major contributions to describing and interpreting "religion" in the archaic and classical polis of Athens, and I (1998) attempted to shed some light on "religion" in Hellenistic Athens, in particular to delineate ways it showed continuity with or change from its classical heritage. I focus again, and unapologetically, this study on the polis Athens. The polis has long been recognized, and more so since Sourvinou-Inwood (1988, 1990) articulated it, as a (or "the") major organizing structure of Greek religion. Each polis had, to greater or lesser degrees, its own pantheon, including gods and heroes, religious calendar, mythological and historical religious traditions, structure of bureaucracy tending to religious matters, and so forth. These elements differed significantly from, say, Athens to Sparta or to Corinth. What an individual Greek worshipper did and experienced in his everyday religious life was determined in good part by the polis into which he or she happened to have been born. Many elements, including especially sacrifice and prayer and the generic names of the gods, can be found in all of them, but sometimes in differing forms. Some scholars prefer to study religion "within" the polis, some "beyond" the polis, some at the deme level, some at the family level, some at the individual level, some in inscriptions, some through archaeology or literature or philosophy or history or art, and others through a wide range or combination of media. All such studies, done well, are perfectly valid and age well and contribute to our efforts to understand the Greek

religious experience. Greek religion is multi-faceted, and we should embrace and attempt to understand each facet, whether it be our facet or not.

Preliminary Remarks

The distinction between "public" and "private" cults has long been considered inadequate, and for the purposes of this study I distinguish between 1) polis cults, whose deities were worshipped by and were thought to benefit the polis as a whole;[19] 2) tribal cults, for each of the ten (or eleven or twelve or thirteen, depending on the period) tribes for its eponymous hero; 3) deme cults, whose deities were worshipped by and administered by demesmen of the 139 individual demes or a small consortium of them; 4) phratry cults, for worship by each individual phratry; 5) gentilic cults, whose membership included the members of one *genos*, i.e., an extended family claiming one, often heroic, ancestor;[20] 6) *oikos* cults of the individual households (*oikoi*); 7) private cults made up of citizen members; 8) private cults made up exclusively of non-citizens; and 9) private cults with both citizen and non-citizen membership. Some deme cults were for the local worship of deities also worshipped in polis cults, and

19 In an excellent study Lambert (2010, esp. 143–149) proposes criteria for determining polis cults and examines the complexities, of which there are many, of doing so. His nine criteria are: public funding; responsibility for physical property of the deity, including sanctuaries, dedications, and leases; priest or priestess having *proedria* in the Theater of Dionysus; the priest or priestess receiving a salary from the polis; sacrifices or dedications by polis officials or on the initiative of the polis; use of cult location as a meeting place by the Ekklesia; laws or decrees of the polis regulating the cult; decrees of the Boule and/or Ekklesia honoring priests or other cult officials; and importance to the community as a whole in terms of breadth of interest and participation in the cult. Not all criteria exist or apply for any one cult, and often one criterion is sufficient. For brief, precise, and excellent discussions of "public" vs. "private" cult in Athens, see also Deshours, 2011.19–22 and Aleshire, 1994. On some of these criteria for deme cults, see Whitehead, 1986.178, and on the complexity of cult activity in the demes Parker, 2005.62–78.

According to Harpocration (s.v. δημοτελῆ), δημοτελής distinguishes "polis" sanctuaries from "other" sanctuaries (ἱερά)," those of orgeones, of *gene* and, apparently, of the demes (δημοτικά). So, too, in the literary sources δημοτελής is used of sanctuaries ([Dem.] 59.85, Aeschin. 1.183 and 3.176), of θυσίαι (Pl. *Leg*. 11.935b6 and Hdt. 6.57.1), and, when the point to be made is that they were of the polis as a whole, of *heortai* (Thuc. 2.15.3 and Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 168). δημοτελής does not occur in the inscriptions, but a few, early instances of δημόσιος seemingly bear the same meaning (*IG* I^3 35.11–12, 136.32, and 255b17).

20 On *gene* in a cult context, see Lambert, 2010.148–52, Blok and Lambert, 2009, and Parker, 1996.284–327.

some polis cults derived from deme or local cults, as that at the Eleusinion adjoining the Agora and as that of Artemis Brauronia on the Acropolis. The membership of all these types of cults might have been all male, all female, or males and females together, depending on the deity and nature of the cult. To these common cults of the various groups we should add the exceptional cases such as, for example, (10) cults apparently established by individuals, as that of Artemis Aristoboule by Themistocles and that of the Muses by Plato.[21]

I have used "polis" as both a noun and adjective for the more common "state," with, e.g., "the Athenian polis" for "the Athenian state" and "polis sacrifices" for "state sacrifices." I do this to distinguish, as above, polis activities from those of other units and to keep in the foreground that Athens was a particular type of state, i.e., a polis.

Significant parts of this study depend on the meanings of certain Greek words and short phrases, and establishing the meaning for many of them is one purpose of this book. Sometimes, especially for terms like εὐσέβεια and ὁσιότης and their cognates, for καλός and ἀγαθός, and for φιλοτιμία there are no simple, convenient translations. The meanings of these terms and phrases in religious contexts will, I hope, become clear (or clearer) in the following pages, but for consistency's sake I maintain the Greek words and phrases, almost always less verbose and always better than an English translation when discussing Greek religion. I use transliterations only rarely and reluctantly. The Greekless readers who find their way here need not despair, however. I present my translations of the critical and most common Greek words in the Glossary of Greek Terms. A great many officials are praised for their religious actions, among them eponymous archons, basileis, strategoi, polemarchs, hipparchs, demarchs, hieropoioi, epimeletai, and boönai. I offer a Glossary of officials and of some other Greek words requiring some clarification.

For my purposes here I treat only classical and Hellenistic texts, with rare excursions into the archaic period. I put the break between the archaic and classical at 510 BC, between the classical and the Hellenistic at the death of Alexander the Great in 323/2 BC, and, in the context of Athenian religion, the break between the Hellenistic and Roman periods at the sack of Athens by the Roman general Sulla in 86 BC.[22] Athens and Athenian religion became significantly different after 86 BC, I think, and I do not venture into the Roman period which deserves more and separate study by those more appreciative of the Roman influence on Athenian society and religion. By literary sources

21 On these divisions in general, see Aleshire, 1994.10–11. On Artemis Aristoboule, see Mikalson, 2003.103 and 127 and 1998.35. On Plato's Muses, see Mikalson, 1998.64–7.

22 For the beginning of the Roman period in Athens at 86 BC, see also Lambert, 2012.81.

I mean poetic, historical, oratorical, and philosophical writers, and I rarely include those after ca. 80 BC. Usually the historians and orators offer the best antecedents and parallels to texts and concepts I consider, but occasionally I broaden the search to philosophical and poetic authors.

Many of the inscriptions can be dated precisely by the name of the eponymous archon.[23] If the archon's year is in dispute or if his name is missing, other data from the text or the letter forms usually allow proposing a date, either to a span of years, e.g. 325–287, or to a whole or part of a century, e.g. IV BC, or first quarter of III BC. I give dates for all texts, following recent scholars' views and indicating with a question mark when there is uncertainty. Even within the historical periods dates are important because we can expect and may find changes over time, from, say, the first decree honoring the priest of Asclepius in 328/7 to the last in 137/6, a period of nearly 200 years. Scholars have claimed some such changes, I have found others, and the inclusion of dates for texts will allow others to evaluate these or to find more.[24]

Most of these inscriptions are, to some degree, incomplete, missing letters, words, lines, or whole sections. Many of these losses have been restored by scholars, and these restorations are sometimes absolutely secure, sometimes not. To those familiar with epigraphical texts, I may seem too conservative in accepting restorations, to those not familiar with them too liberal. I accept those restorations that appear correct to me.[25] I indicate restored portions in these texts with the conventional square brackets [ ]. Angular brackets < > indicate editors' additions of letters not present on the stone. In my translations, as in the Timocrite decree, parentheses ( ) indicate additions I have made to complete the sense.

For literary authors and texts I use mostly the abbreviations of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, fourth edition. The epigraphical texts have almost all been published several times, and I attempt to identify each by its most recent or best edition. For these references, see the Abbreviations section. Occasionally the most convenient text is in *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (*SEG*), as for the Timocrite decree, and I use that when possible. Each text has its own bibliographical history, sometimes quite long. I give only bibliography relevant to the topic at hand. For some texts background is more necessary,

23 For the chronologically difficult years of 300/299–228/7 I follow the archon list of Osborne, 2009 as adopted for *IG* II^3.

24 The value of such diachronic work is amply demonstrated by Shear's (2001) study of the Panathenaia.

25 In general terms and in terms of restorations, I have tried to follow the principle epigrammatically stated by Whitehead, 1993.51: "certainties first, conjecture later."

and for them I give a fuller bibliography at the most extensive treatment of the text. These extended bibliographies are indicated by italicized page numbers in the Index of Inscriptions. I do not include bibliography for each deity, cult, *heorte*, official, or other item not essential to my purposes.[26] The material to be covered, textual and bibliographic, to say nothing of all the newly appearing writings on Greek religion, is immense, and it would be hybristic to claim that I have found everything relevant to all my discussions.[27] I do hope, however, to have provided sufficient and representative material to support the arguments and claims I make.

The laws of Solon, including his religious calendar, appear in discussions frequently, especially in regard to τὰ πάτρια and the *nomoi* of the Athenians on religious matters. There is considerable disagreement and dispute about which of the laws attributed to Solon were really his or were remodelings of his or even completely fabricated attributions.[28] For our purposes what is important is that certain laws, often associated with τὰ πάτρια, were claimed or believed, from the fifth century BC on, to be Solon's, and in a study of religious matters we are here, as often, more concerned with what was believed than with what was, if it can be determined, factual. And so in this study we accept, although fully recognizing the possible difficulties, what are claimed in the fifth century and later to be the laws of Solon on religious matters.

The use of literally hundreds of texts allows us to recognize relatively easily individual texts that are idiosyncratic and that may mislead us in various ways. Two such epigraphical texts are *SEG* 21.469C of 129/8 which reorganizes, revives, and enhances various cults of Apollo, and the texts recording preparations and financing for the Pythaïs, the *theoria* to Delphi, from 103/2–97/6.[29] In these documents roles and financial contributions are assigned to government officials and priests that are found nowhere else in our sources and that often contradict what appears in numerous other sources. Each records what appear to be several short-lived innovations of its own time and is valuable in other ways. Each will be treated here, but not all the details of each should

26 Parker (1996 and 2005) offers abundant information and sources for Athenian deities and cults. For a convenient "check list" and brief descriptions of *heortai* and rituals, see 2005.456–85.

27 I beg particular indulgence for my collection of *nomoi* and *psephismata* in Chapter 7. Such a collection has not been attempted before, and religious material often turns up unexpectedly in them and can easily be missed.

28 For recent discussions of the questions, see Scafuro, 2006 and Rhodes, 2006. See also Parker, 1996.43–55 and Ruschenbusch, 1966.

29 *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #3.2–5 of 106/5, *SEG* 32.218 of 98/7, and *FD* 3.2.27.4–7 of 138/7.

be used in recreating the administrative and financial structure of religion in Athens in the Hellenistic period. What they have to offer must be balanced against what is found in the mass of other documents. Also, some texts, especially those preserved in some speeches of Demosthenes, are so at variance with what we otherwise know of Athenian religion of the time that they must be excluded from our sources, for reasons I detail in Appendices 1 and 2. What is striking about the epigraphical and literary sources, however, is not how different and self-contradictory they are, but how uniform and mutually supporting they are, and in light of that we must recognize the idiosyncratic as idiosyncratic.

PART 1

Approbation

∵

CHAPTER 1

The Qualifiers of Athenian Religious Practices

In the Athenian epigraphical texts a number of adverbs and phrases are used to commend those who have performed sacrifices and a whole range of other religious activities, whether these individuals be polis officials, priests and priestesses, private individuals, or members of private associations. Such qualifiers of sacrifice and other religious activities are very rare in the literary texts,[1] and most interestingly the most common formulae used in the epigraphical texts do not occur at all in the literary texts. The epigraphical texts thus offer a new look at what the Athenians, at least in the Hellenistic period, thought to be the proper and commendable performance of sacrifices and other religious activities.

Sacrifice

The Act of Sacrifice

καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς ("beautifully and in a way showing proper respect")[2]

The phrase καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, which does not occur in classical or Hellenistic Greek literature, is used in inscriptions almost exclusively to praise those who actually performed sacrifices: an archon, agonothetai, prytaneis, hipparch, a priest of Asclepius, and a priestess of the Thesmophoroi at Melite.[3] Only once is an official, appointed "for the (financial) administration of the

1 They do not occur, for example, in the fullest descriptions of sacrifices we have in the literary sources, as in Hom. *Il.* 1.446–74 and *Od.* 3.418–63 and 14.414–45, Ar. *Pax* 937–1126 and *Av.* 848–903, 958–991, and 1515–1524, Men. *Dys.* 436–75, and Is. 8.15–16, or even in descriptions of sacrifices gone wrong, S. *Ant.* 1005–11 and Eur. *El.* 781–843, *HF* 922–41, and *Hel.* 1559–89.

2 In the text I leave this and similar phrases in the Greek, but in introducing them I offer in a preliminary way translations which will be argued for throughout the book. καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς previously has usually been translated by me (e.g., 1998.266) and others as "well and piously." I now question both elements of that translation.

3 Archon, *IG* II^2 668.10–13 of 282/1; agonothetai, *IG* II^2 780.14–15 of 252/1; prytaneis, *Agora* 15.253.10–12 of 118/7; hipparchs, *Agora* 16.270.3–4 of ca. 184/3; priest of Asclepius, *SEG* 18.26.9–11 of 137/6 (Cf. *IG* II^3 1330.7–8); priestess of Thesmophoroi, *Agora* 16.277.3–4 of early II BC.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_003

city,"[4] said to have "appropriated money" (ἐμέρισεν)[5] καλῶ[ς καὶ εὐσεβῶ]ς for making sacrifices,[6] if we can trust the restoration. This, if properly restored, is the earliest (ca. 336–324) attestation of the phrase. The next is from 282/1.

The import of the phrase is suggested by three texts using the same formula, that is, that sacrifices have been made or are to be made ὅπως ἂν ἔχῃ καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς . . . τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς ("So that the things relating to the gods may be beautiful and showing proper respect").[7] A late and unusually discursive text (*SEG* 21.469C.18–20 of 129/8) offers even more: the Boule and Demos are "to increase both the sacrifices and the honors καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς so that they may acquire from the gods the deserved return favors."[8]

These texts offer, in essence, related reasons why it was deemed important to sacrifice καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς.[9] And, Aristotle (*Rh.* 1383b4–6) tells us, it contributes to humans' θάρσος, "courage, the opposite of fear," "if the things relating to the gods are beautiful (or good) (καλῶς) for them, both the other things and the things from omens and oracles."[10] Here we may include sacrifices under "the other things."

---

4 [ἐ]πὶ τῇ διοι[κήσει τ]ῆς πόλεως.

5 For the term ἐμέρισεν, see Eide, 1984.

6 *Agora* 16.77.7–11.

7 Prytaneis, *Agora* 15.89.13–15 of 259/8; Thracian orgeones of Bendis, *IG* II^2 1283.22–27 of 261/0; and demarch of Rhamnous, *I. Rhamnous* II.6.8–11 of 263/2. Cf. *I. Rhamnous* II.17.27–30 of 235/4.

8 προσεπ[αύ]ξον<τες> τάς τε θυσίας καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς ἵνα καὶ παρὰ τῶν θεῶ[ν] κτήσωνται τὰς καταξίας χάριτας. On the Panhellenic movement "to increase" the *heortai* in this period in various ways, see Chaniotis, 2013.31–4. On "the deserved return favors" for τὰς καταξίας χάριτας, χάρις is not just "favor" or "thanks" but a "favor" in the continuous mutual exchange of "favors" in the healthy relationship of humans and gods. See Mikalson, 2010.14–15 and 178–80 and Parker, 1998. καταξίας is "worthy," here "worthy of the χάριτες rendered by the worshippers, hence, in their view, "deserved." On all aspects of the text of *SEG* 21.469C, see Deshours, 2011.105–13 and Mikalson, 1998.272–4.

9 Of the examples of εὐσεβῶς alone, with no other adverbs, to describe a sacrifice, all but *SEG* 45.101.27 of 293/2 (where εὐσε[β]ῶς is followed by καὶ κα[τ]ὰ τὰ π[άτ]ρια) depend on restorations, none absolutely compelling. See, e.g., *IG* II^2 690.5 and *I. Rhamnous* II.50.22–23. In Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.68 εὐσεβῶς is combined with φιλοδ[όξως].

10 ἂν τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτοῖς καλῶς ἔχῃ, τά τε ἄλλα καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ σημείων καὶ λογίων.

καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ("beautifully and in a manner showing a love of honor")[11]

This phrase, like καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, is used to praise individuals who actually performed sacrifices: prytaneis, priests of Zeus Soter, Asclepius, and Kalliste, and epimeletai of the Mysteries and other epimeletai.[12]

φιλοτιμία ("love of honor")

Cognates of φιλοτιμία used alone, without other adverbs, of sacrificial activity are rare and each is distinct, clearly not formulaic as the other modifiers of sacrifice we have seen thus far. In the deme decree of *IG* II^2 1204.3–7 of the end of IV BC, the individual, not a fellow demesman, is φιλότιμος towards both sacrifices and other affairs of the deme. In *IG* II^2 1327.7–10 of 178/7 the individual, a member of the *koinon* of the Mother of the Gods, is, uniquely, "to show his love of honor in sacrificing the sacrifices to the gods"[13] and often contributed his own funds for these sacrifices. In *Agora* 15.89.13–15 of 259/8 the prytaneis have sacrificed φιλοτίμως, but immediately is added the elaboration we saw above, ὅπως ἂν ἔχει καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς . . . τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς.

καλῶς ("beautifully")[14]

καλῶς is the most common modifier of praiseworthy sacrificial activity as we have seen in the formulae καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς and καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, and it is important to note that καλῶς is always given precedence in these formulae.[15] Sacrifices are to be performed καλῶς, εὐσεβῶς, and φιλοτίμως, but either of the latter two might be omitted in the commendation, but that they were performed καλῶς is always there.

---

11 This phrase has also been translated variously as "well and with a love of honor," "well and generously," "well and zealously," and "well and ambitiously."

12 Prytaneis, *Agora* 15.78.11–12 of 273/2, 15.115.12–13 and 17–19 of 234/3; *IG* II^3 1139.16–19 of 227/6; 1162.17–19 of 214/3; 1304.13–15 of 180/79 (?); *SEG* 40.107.11–12 of 175/4; *Agora* 15.238.15–16 of 145/4; and 15.240.15–16 of 140/39. Priest of Zeus Soter, Lambert, 2012.99–100, #6.20–22 of 272/1 (?); of Asclepius, *IG* II^2 1163.5–8 of 284/3; of Kalliste, *IG* II^2 788.10–12 of 235/4 (?). Epimeletai, *IG* II^3 1329.8–11 of 173/2 and *Agora* 16.186.11–15 of 272/1.

13 φιλοτιμούμενος τάς τε θυσίας τοῖς θεοῖς θύεσθαι, an unparalleled phrase.

14 Commonly translated as "well."

15 The one example of καλῶς used alone, but followed by καὶ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, in these contexts is *IG* II^2 1247.4–7, a decree of the Mesogeoi, of mid-III BC. The other example is based on a restoration, *SEG* 29.135.5–6.

ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις ("at the appropriate times")

It was obviously of great importance that sacrifices be made at the appropriate times, and that they were done so was occasionally part of the commendation of kosmetai of the ephebes, an agonothetes, and the epimeletai of the Mysteries.[16] The phrase is found in [Dem.] 59.78 in reference to the celebration of *heortai*. The more common phrase in literature is ἐν τοῖς προσήκουσι χρόνοις, as in Plato, *Lg*. 7.835b2–3 and Theopompus, *FGrHist* 115 F 344.21–2.

Summary for Act of Sacrifice

The commendation of the agonothetes of 252/1 (*IG* II² 780.12–15) offers the fullest description of these various elements that attended sacrifices:

> Since the agonothetes, making proper respect (εὐσέβειαν) towards the gods of the highest importance and showing the goodwill (εὔνοιαν)[17] and love of honor (φιλοτιμίαν) which he has towards the Demos of Athenians, sacrificed all the ancestral sacrifices at the appropriate times beautifully and with proper respect (καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς)....[18]

The sacrifices were made καλῶς and εὐσεβῶς at the appropriate times. The εὐσέβεια is directed to the gods and is that which the agonothetes makes of the most importance. The εὔνοια and φιλοτιμία are directed to fellow Athenians.[19]

Finally, it should be noted that a sacrifice to Demetrius Poliorcetes is to be made ὡς σεμνότατα καὶ κάλλιστα (*SEG* 25.149.17–18 of ca. 302), completely at variance from the usual formula and with εὐσεβῶς replaced by a less charged

---

16 Kosmetai of ephebes, *IG* II² 1008.59 of 118/7, 1011.39–40 of 106/5; of agonothetes, *IG* II² 780.14–15 of 252/1; of epimeletai, *IG* II³ 1329.8–10 of 173/2. The prytaneis of 234/3 sacrificed to the Soteres ἐν τ[αῖ]ς καθηκούσαις ἡμέραις ("on the appropriate days") (*Agora* 15.115.12–13), and the *proeranistra* of the *koinon* of the Sarapiastae in 215/4 sacrificed ἐν το[ῖς] χρόνοις το[ῖς τεταγμ]ένοις ("at the assigned times") (*IG* II² 1292.22–5).

17 This is the "more formalized version of εὔνοια that manifests goodwill through actions that benefit Athens, such as military aid, the ransoming of prisoners of war, the supplying of grain" (Cook, 2009.37). In polis decrees it is used, as here, of other agonothetai, *IG* II² 956.30–1 and 958.26, but not of those performing other religious duties. Possible exceptions are *Agora* 16.214.17–18 and *IG* II² 677.12. On the term, see Cook, 2009.36–43, Whitehead, 1993, esp. 52–4, and Veligianni-Terzi, 1997.200–2 and 218–19.

18 ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ ἀγωνοθέτης περὶ πλείστου ποιούμεν[ος τὴν πρ]ὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ ἀποδεικνύμενος [τ]ὴν εὔνοιαν [καὶ φιλοτι]μίαν ἣν ἔχει πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων τάς τε θυσίας πά[σας ἔθυσε τ]ὰς πατρίους ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶ[ς, ...].

19 On this, see Chapter 13. On πάτριοι θυσίαι versus other designations for sacrifices, see p. 110.

word. Here is perhaps a distinction between the cult of gods and heroes and that of rulers.

"Service" (λειτουργία) *at Sacrifices*

In 127/6 the ephebes and their kosmetes separately were commended because they served (ἐλειτούργησαν) εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως in all the sacrifices, leaving out nothing of the necessary things (οὐθὲν ἐνλείποντες τῶν ἀναγκαίων).[20] One such service may well have been the "liftings of the cows" (ἄρσεις τῶν βοῶν) required at some sacrifices.[21] In 122/1 the kosmetes of the ephebes is praised for having done this ἐπάνδρως ("in a manly way") in sacrifices at Eleusis, surely at the Mysteries, and at the Proerosia and other sacrifices,[22] and the ephebes themselves are regularly praised for doing it "with good form" (εὐσχημόνως), usually in sacrifices at the Mysteries.[23] They also performed this service

---

20 *SEG* 15.104.19–20 and 86–7. Cf. *IG* II^3 1166.11 of 213/2 and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.61–3 of 116/5.

21 As in *IG* II^3 1176.11 of 203/2, 1256.9 and 14–15 of 196/5 and 1313.9–10 of 176/5 and 90–1 of 175/4. On the nature of this action as part of the ritual for some sacrifices, see Deshours, 2011.174 and Van Straten, 1995.109–13. Some take the ἐλειτούργησαν of these ephebic texts to indicate that the ephebes as a group "paid for" the sacrificial victims they sacrificed (Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.257 and Lambert, 2012.82). Such is the usual implication of a liturgy, but not here, I think. In Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.61–3, when the kosmetes paid for the sacrifices, it is explicitly said to be ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, and that is distinct from the following item, that he performed his liturgy εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως.

λειτουργία can sometimes mean simply "service," without personal financial contributions, as in, e.g., Dem. 21.56 and Arist. *Pol.* 3.1278a12 and 1279a11, 4.1291a35–7, and 7.1335b28. It has its more familiar meaning in Arist. *Pol.* 5.1305a5, 1309a18, and 1314b14, and 6.1320b4 and 1321a33, and may be either in 2.1272a20, 4.1291a35, and 7.1330a13. See, also, Lewis, 1960 and 1965. One could perform a liturgy with the body as well as with property, and they are sometimes contrasted (*Ath. Pol.* 29.5, Lys. 19.58 and 31.15, Dem. 10.28 and 21.165). This leads me to conclude that the liturgy of the ephebes concerned a "service," not money or victims, that they provided, with their bodies, at some sacrifices, as, e.g., the ἄρσεις τῶν βοῶν at the Mysteries, and in a *pompe* (as in *IG* II^3 1256.8–9) for which the adverbial modifiers are more appropriate. I belabor this here because it becomes important later in determining who pays for what in the Hellenistic period.

22 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.78–9. Cf. restoration of *IG* I^3 82.29. What is probably meant here is not that the kosmetes did the ἄρσις himself, but that, as said explicitly in *IG* II^3 1313.90–1, "He took care that at the Great Mysteries the ephebes made the 'lifting of the cows' through their own efforts" (ἐφρόντισεν ὅπως τοῖς μεγάλοις Μυστηρίοις τὴν τῶν βοῶν ἄρσιν οἱ ἔφηβοι [ποιή]σωνται δι' ἑαυτῶν).

23 *IG* II^2 1008.11–12 of 118/7, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.13 of 101/0, and *IG* II^2 1029.9 of 94/3. Cf. 1030.7–9.

εὐτάκτως ("in an orderly manner") at the Proerosia.[24] These "liftings of the cows" were praised in secular and esthetic terms (ἐπάνδρως, εὐσχημόνως, εὐτάκτως), not religious ones, but the service itself is a matter of εὐσέβεια, surely because it was part of the ritual of the sacrifice. The ephebes also performed another such service in the performance of *pompai*.[25] Finally, the ephebes once "served" the Semnai ἀνεγκλήτως ("in a blameless manner"), the only example of this adverb in a religious context.[26]

Supervising (ἐπιμελεῖσθαι) *Sacrifices*

Individuals, epimeletai, especially of private associations, who "supervised" (ἐπιμελεῖσθαι) sacrifices might be commended for having done their work καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, but only when they supervised both sacrifices and other activities or affairs, some secular, of the group.[27] When they are not praised for their εὐσέβεια, it should be assumed that these individuals did not themselves perform the sacrifices. The epimeletai of the *pompe* of Dionysus in 186/5 actually sacrificed and hence are commended for both their εὐσέβεια and φιλοτιμία.[28]

Heortai and Their Components

The Panathenaia is to be held καλῶς by the hieropoioi for all time; the Aixoneis are to "make" (ποιῶσιν) their Dionysia ἀεὶ ὡς κάλλιστα ("always as beautiful as possible") and the Eleusinians want that their Dionysia ὡς κάλλιστα γένηται ("be as beautiful as possible)";[29] the Athenians pass laws so that the *penteteris*

---

24 *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.28 of 101/0 and *IG* II^2 1029.16–17 of 94/3. That a number of men could be required for this activity is indicated by *IG* I^3 82.29–30 of 421/0 where the hieropoioi are to select 200 Athenians so that ἀρῶνται τοὺς βοῦς at the Hephaisteia.

25 *IG* II^3 1256.8–9.

26 *SEG* 15.104.26 of 127/6. Cf. *IG* II^3 1332.17.

27 Bouleutai, *Agora* 15.45.7–12 of 331/0–330/29; tamias of prytaneis, 15.86.12–14 of III BC; astynomoi, *SEG* 16.65.11–16 of 272/1, as restored; various deme officials, Schwenk #70.2–6 of 325/4 and *IG* II^2 1247.23–5 of mid-III; and various officials of private associations, *IG* II^2 1259.1–5 of 313/2, 1262.3–7 of 301/0, *SEG* 44.60.2–4 of 244/3, *SEG* 59.155.2–5 of 243/2 and 59.152.3–6 of 251/0. On epimeletai of private associations, see Arnaoutoglou, 2003.108–9. The one example of supervising just sacrifices is based on an unlikely correction of the text, *SEG* 2.7.2–5 of 330–325.

28 *IG* II^3 1284.34–41. Cf. *IG* II^2 676.10–33, *I. Eleusis* 181.8–29, and *IG* II^3 1188.22–33.

29 Cf. the restoration of *IG* II^2 713.9–11.

of Amphiaraus ὡς καλλίστη γίγνηται ("may be as beautiful as possible").[30] No formula is apparent, but the prevalence of the *heorte*'s κάλλος ("beauty") to the exclusion of all other elements is noteworthy.[31] For those who supervised *heortai*, φιλοτιμία as well as κάλλος was involved. The tamias of Acharnai together with the demarch supervised (ἐπεμελήθη) the deme's Dionysia καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως as they did the components of the *heortai*: the sacrifice, *pompe*, and *agones*. So, too, the epimeletai of Amphiaraus' *heorte* supervised καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως the *pompe, agones*, and all the other matters concerning the *panegyris*. The Boule of 343/2 supervised καλῶς the "good order" ([εὐκοσμίας]) concerning the *heorte* of Dionysus.[32] The demarch of Ikarion in the mid-fourth century "made" the *heorte* for Dionysus καλῶς καὶ δικαίως, and the demesmen of Ionidai and Kydantidai commend their kolokratai and priest of Heracles for having supervised their Herakleia καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως and praise them also δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας. In these two cases δικαιοσύνη ("honesty") is included no doubt because administration of money was also involved.[33]

Of a different type is the Athenian praise of Milesians who came to Athens on a *theoria* sometime in the years 180–160. The archetheoros and his fellow theoroi are praised "because of their εὐσέβεια towards the gods and their ἀρετή ("virtue") and φιλοτιμία towards the Demos of Athenians and their own fatherland,"[34] and they are awarded citizenship. They in all likelihood sacrificed in Athens as part of their *theoria*. Differently phrased but reflecting much the same thing is the Athenian praise of ambassadors sent from Priene ca. 200 to the quadrennial Panathenaia. They "wished to increase the honors (τιμάς) being performed for the gods by the (Athenian) Demos."[35]

---

30 Panathenaia, *IG* II^3 447.29–33 of ca. 335–330; Dionysia of Aixone, *SEG* 36.186.12–13 of 313/2; Dionysia of Eleusis, *I. Eleusis* 70.11–12 of mid-IV BC; and *penteteris* of Amphiaraus, *IG* II^3 348.12–13 of 332/1.

31 In the Callias decree, in a discussion of the provision of equipment for the Panathenaia, the clause ὅπ[ως ἂν ὡς] βέλτιστα τêι θεῶι γένηται ("so that it may be as good as possible for the goddess") refers to the celebration of the Panathenaia (*SEG* 28.60.66–9 of 270/69). The εὐσεβῶς in connection with the celebration of the Kronia in *Agora* 15.81.6 of 267/6 is based on an unlikely restoration. Note alternative restoration in *SEG* 42.100.

32 Dionysia of Acharnai, *SEG* 43.26.A5–7 and B1–6 of 315/4; Amphiaraus' *heorte, IG* II^3 355.11–20 of 329/8; and Boule and (City) Dionysia, *IG* II^3 306.22–3 of 343/2.

33 Ikarion, *IG* II^2 1178 of mid-IV BC; Ionidai and Kydantidai, *SEG* 39.148 of 331/0.

34 *SEG* 42.1072.6–8, [εὐσεβείας τε ἕνεκεν τῆ]ς πρὸς τοὺ[ς θεοὺς καὶ ἀ]ρετῆς καὶ φιλοτιμία[ς τῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸ]ν Ἀθηναίω[ν καὶ τὴν ἑαυ]τῶν πατρίδα.

35 *IG* II^3 1239.9–11. On Priene's long tradition of sending a *theoria* for the Panathenaia, see Rutherford, 2013.255.

Pannychides (*"all-night rituals"*)

Both κάλλος ("beauty") and φιλοτιμία were involved in the celebration of *pannychides*. The hieropoioi of the annual Panathenaia were to make its *pannychis* ὡς καλλίστην τῆι θεῶι ("as beautiful as possible for the goddess").[36] The sophronistai and the herald were praised by their fellow demesmen φιλοτιμίας ἕνεκα τῆς περὶ τὴν παννυχίδα at the *heorte* of Hebe.[37] The astynomoi were also credited for having supervised this *pannychis* καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως.[38]

Pompai (*"processions"*)

Commendations regarding *pompai* concern almost exclusively lay officials who organized and supervised them.[39] Only two groups are praised, and only rarely, for the manner of their participation in the *pompai*: the ephebes and the ergastinai.[40] The ephebes of 122/1 "joined in the *pompe* (συνεπόμπευσαν) καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως for Athena Nike.[41] The ephebes of 79/8, "maintaining their εὐσέβεια towards the gods joined in all the *pompai* for the city and performed their "services" (λειτουργίας).[42] The ergastinai praised in 103/2 "processed according to their assignments, as beautifully and with the best form possible (ὡς ὅτι κ[άλλισ]τα καὶ εὐσχημονέ[στατα]), as did those of 108/7.[43] Noteworthy is how late these texts are in our sequence, some falling even in the Roman period.

---

36 *IG* II^3 447.58–9 of ca. 335–330. Cf. *IG* I^3 136.27 of 413/2 (?). On this *pannychis* and this translation of καλλίστην, see Shear, 2001.83–4.

37 *IG* II^2 1199.17–22 of 320/19. On these deme sophronistai and this *heorte* of Hebe, see Parker, 2005.71 and Makres, 2003.

38 *SEG* 16.65.11–16 of 272/1, heavily restored. The prytaneis of 118/7 made the *pannychis* for Athena at the Chalkeia εὖ, a likely restoration but an uncommon adverb in a religious context (*Agora* 15.253.9–10 of 118/7). That the priest of Asclepius made the *pannychis* of Asclepius ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ is based on a restoration (*SEG* 18.19.20 of 244/3).

39 On the use of epigraphical evidence for *pompai*, see Deshours, 2011.29–30. On all aspects of the *pompe* of the annual and quadrennial Panathenaia, see Shear, 2001.75–77, 87–91, and 122–167.

40 Participation in the *pompai* is indicated by the verbs συμπέμπειν and συμπομπεύειν (not πέμπειν).

41 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.14–15. For the possibility of behaving ἀσχημόνως in a *pompe*, see Aeschines 2.151.

42 *SEG* 22.110.53–4, διαφυλάττοντες δὲ καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν τά[ς τε πομπ]ὰς συνέπεμψαν τῆι πόλει πάσας. εὐσέβεια may be included here because of their "services" at sacrifices.

43 Ergastinai of 103/2, *IG* II^2 1034.10–12; of 108/7, *SEG* 53.143.11–14 (as restored). On these texts see Deshours, 2011.131–6, Aleshire and Lambert, 2003, and Shear, 2001.89 and 99–102.

Elected epimeletai, an archon of both the polis and a deme, agonothetai, and even astynomoi supervised (ἐπιμελεῖσθαι) or sent (πέμπειν) various *pompai*. It was the agonothetai of the Theseia predominately who were said to have "sent" a *pompe*, always one that was εὐσχήμων.[44] The epimeletes for the cult of Bendis "sent" a *pompe* ἀξίως τῆς θε[οῦ].[45] Other officials were praised for "supervising" the *pompai*, usually in conjunction with other religious activities, by the conventional phrase καλῶς καὶ φιλοτιμῶς.[46]

IG II^3 1284 of 186/5 offers an interesting combination of many of the elements we have seen, but also introduces a private citizen. The epimeletai of the *pompe* (of the City Dionysia) with the archon "sent" the *pompe* "in a manner showing as best they could a love of honor" (ὡς ἠδύναντο φιλοτιμότατα)[47] (lines 36–37). The father of one of the kanephoroi who participated in the *pompe* is commended for having sent his daughter to carry the sacred basket for the god, for having himself "led" a sacrificial victim that was "as beautiful as it could be" (ὡς ἠδύνατο κάλλιστον), and for having supervised (ἐπιμεμελῆσθαι) the remaining things that fell to him for the *pompe* καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως (lines 8–14).[48]

καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως are used to commend those who supervise *pompai*, but only in combination with other religious activities. The particular concern for *pompai* seems to have been that they be performed or managed καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως. In literary texts *pompai* are not commonly characterized, but when they are, it is usually in esthetic terms. A *pompe* may be καλή or καλλίστη, a "beauty" that comes from its "order" (τάξις) according to Xenophon (*Hipp*. 2.1). Apart from being in the *pompe*, "watching it" is featured,[49] and the *pompai* themselves should be made "worth seeing" (ἀξιοθέατοι) (Xen. *Hipp*. 3.1).[50]

---

44 The formula τὴν πομπὴν ἔπεμψεν εὐσχημόνα may be confidently restored by combining *IG* II^2 956.4–5 of 161/0, 957.3 of 157/6, and 958.4 of 153/2. Cf. *SEG* 40.121.10. On these texts see Deshours, 2011.113–123. *IG* I^3 82.24–5 of 421/0 has been restored to have the hieropoioi supervise the *pompe* ὅπος [ἂν ὁς κάλλιστα] πενφθῆι.

45 *IG* II^2 1324.4–5 of early II BC. For his φιλοτιμία in this, see line 6.

46 Epimeletai for *heorte* of Amphiaraus, *IG* II^3 355.11–16 of 329/8; astynomoi in the *heorte* of Asclepius, *SEG* 16.65.11–14 of 272/1, as restored; archon of the Mesogeioi and others, including the priest of Heracles, for the *pompe* for Heracles, *IG* II^2 1247.7–9, 23–25 of mid-III BC; and the hieropoioi for the *pompe* of Bendis in 337/6, Schwenk #13.2–5.

47 In *Agora* 16.181.10–13 of 282/1 the archon is praised for having sacrificed and supervised the *pompe* for Dionysus also simply φιλοτίμως, without the usual καλῶς.

48 On this text see Mikalson, 1998.198–9.

49 Pl. *Rep*. 1.327a, Theoc. *Id*. 2.72, and [Aeschin.] *Epist*. 10.6.

50 On this for the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, see Chaniotis, 2013.

Xenophon wants the *pompai* in which the cavalry participates to be "most pleasing (κεχαρισμενωτάτας) to the gods and the spectators" (3.2).[51]

A level road would probably help in making a *pompe* easier and perhaps even more beautiful, and *IG* II^2 380.17–23 of 320/19 includes a provision that the agoronomoi of Piraeus, who have been assigned the *epimeleia* of the astynomoi, see to it that the roads for the *pompe* of Zeus Soter and Dionysus be made level and prepared ὡς βέλτιστα.[52]

Agones (*"contests"*)

Five aspects of *agones* occur in the inscriptions: the establishment of them; payment of their costs; "supervision" and "administration;" provision of the prizes; and competition in them.

In 250/49 the Athenians praised the *koinon* of the Aetolians for having established the *agon* of the Soteria for Zeus Soter and Apollo Pythios, thereby "showing their εὐσέβεια towards the gods."[53]

Choregoi earlier and some agonothetai later paid the cost for some *agones*, particularly in the cult of Dionysus.[54] In one of our earliest texts, *IG* II^2 1138.3–5 of ca. 403/2, the tribesmen of Pandion praise their choregos because of his "manly goodness" (ἀνδραγαθία) towards the tribe and because he served as choregos "well and eagerly" (εὖ καὶ προθύμως),[55] but καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως was the standard praise for the work of choregoi[56] and epimeletai.[57] In Isaeus 7.40 the speaker makes the choregos' victory tripod a "memorial of his

51 Because of the topic with which it is concerned, [Pl.] *Alc.* II 148e and 150a put emphasis on the expense: πολυτελεῖς.

52 On this text see Mikalson, 1998.51–2.

53 *IG* II^2 680.5–8, ἀποδεικνύμενον τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν. This phrase, interestingly, is rare in Athenian texts but is frequent, sometimes with variants, in texts from elsewhere. See Appendix 6. In *IG* II^2 680 the Athenians may be quoting from the Aetolians' original invitation, concerning which see Mikalson, 1998.166. Isocrates alone of Athenian prose authors uses a similar phrase (11.27). On the Delphian Soteria see Rutherford, 2013.45, 246, and 268–9.

In *I. Rhamnous* II.22.3–6 of 229/8 Demostratus may have instituted a new torch race and hence is praised for "making εὐσέβεια towards the gods of most importance" ([περὶ π]λείστου ποιούμενος τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβε[ιαν καὶ] τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας φιλοτιμίαν).

54 About which see Chapter 5.

55 For προθύμως, rare in religious documents, see Cook, 2009.43–6, Whitehead, 1993.49–50, and Veligianni-Terzi, 1997.195–8.

56 *SEG* 34.103.2–5 of 335–315, *IG* II^2 1200 of 317/6, Schwenk #65.1–5 and 66.2–7 of 326/5, and *SEG* 36.186.2–4 of 313/2.

57 *IG* II^3 355.11–15 of 329/8. Note also *IG* II^3 473.2–7.

φιλοτιμία."[58] The usual praise for agonothetai for "making" (ποιεῖν) or "supervising" (ἐπιμελεῖσθαι) *agones* was also that they did their work καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως.[59] The praise for Phaedrus, when he served as agonothetes, explicates, as it were, the meaning of καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως: "he supervised (them) . . . so that . . . the *agones* be as beautiful as possible (ὡς κάλλιστοι) and worthy of the φιλοτιμία of the Demos."[60] The demarch of Eleusis also "managed" (ἔθηκε) the *agon* of the Dionysia for the Eleusinians, lacking nothing of effort (σπουδή) and φιλοτιμία.[61]

The agonothetai of the Theseia, and only they, were commended for the prizes they "set out" (τίθημι) for the competitors, because the agonothetai lacked nothing of σπουδή or of φιλοτιμία. The prizes of one agonothetes were καλὰ καὶ εὐσχημόνα.[62]

In *SEG* 15.104.12–13, 23, and 131 it is twice said that the ephebes of 127/6 ran their torch race καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως, once that they completed their races εὐσχημόνως.[63] So, too, ephebes of 204/3 and those of 197/6 competed καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως.[64] Interestingly, ephebes after the sack of Sulla, in 79/8 and 38/7 are commended for competing "in a manly way" (ἐπάνδρως) and "in a manner bringing good repute" (ἐνδόξως), a change of emphasis, perhaps.[65]

In the context of *agones*, εὐσέβεια was involved in their founding, perhaps in the greater context of founding a *heorte*. Otherwise the emphasis for administrators, donors, and competitors is on τὸ κάλλος, with φιλοτιμία added for the adminstrators and with εὐσχημοσύνη for the competitors.

Tables and Couches for the Gods

The priest of Asclepius "adorned" (ἐκόσμησεν) the table for Asclepius and did so καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως. The priestess of Athena Polias also had supervision

58 The φιλοτιμία involved with being a choregos is occasionally mentioned in the prose sources (e.g., Dem. 18.257 and 21.67–9 and Arist. *EN* 4.1122b21–3), but most often the expense is emphasized, as in Lysias 21, Aeschin. 1.11, Dem. 20.19, [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.3, and Arist. *Pol.* 5.1309a17–20.

59 *SEG* 45.101.30–2 of 293/2, *IG* II^2 780.16–18 of 252/1, and *SEG* 39.125.14–15 of 255/4.

60 *IG* II^2 682.54–6 of 276/5, ἐπεμελήθη . . . ὅπως ἂν . . . οἱ ἀγῶνες ὡς κάλλιστοι [γένω]νται καὶ ἄξιοι τῆς τοῦ δήμου φιλοτιμίας.

61 *I. Eleusis* 229.33–4 of 165/4, [σπουδ]ῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐλλείπων. For this meaning of τίθημι, see LSJ *s.v.* A VII. On this text see Deshours, 2011.147–9.

62 *IG* II^2 956.9–10 of 161/0, 957.5–6 of 157/6, and 958.8–9 of 153/2.

63 Cf. *IG* II^3 1166.13–15 of 213/2 and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.17 of 116/5.

64 *IG* II^3 1176.14–15 and 1256.9–10.

65 *SEG* 22.110.20–21 and *IG* II^2 1043.27–28. *IG* II^2 713.11–14 has been restored to have a flute player in the Dionysia competing καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως.

over such an "adornment" of a table, and also did it [καλ]ῶς καὶ φιλοτίμ[ως].[66] Bacchis, the epimeletria of the *thiasos* of Agathe Thea, supervised the covering of the throne and of the table καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως.[67] The orgeones of the Mother of the Gods want their priestess to "put covers on" (στρωννύειν) two thrones that are [ὡς] καλλίστους, and another priestess of the same cult "put covers on" a couch for the Attideia and prepared the remaining things καλῶς and "in a way befitting sacred things (ἱεροπρεπῶς), leaving aside nothing of φιλοτιμίας."[68]

Property of the Gods

Sanctuaries

First one needed to establish boundaries for a sanctuary, and the inscriptions record two instances where disputed boundaries are settled. In *IG* I^3 84.7–8 of 418/7 the horistai are to establish the boundaries of the sanctuary of Codrus and Neleus, so that "things may be as good as possible (ὁς βέλτιστα) and showing respect as much as possible (εὐσεβέστατα)."[69] In *IG* II^3 292 of 352/1 fifteen commissioners are to establish the boundaries of the sacred *orgas* on the boundary adjoining Megara, swearing that they are acting "not because of favor or hatred . . . and [ὡς δι]καιότατα καὶ εὐσεβέστατα" (9–10).[70] Elaborate divinatory procedures are employed in this matter, "so that the things relating to the two gods may be as much as possible showing respect (ὡς εὐσεβέστατα) and so that

66 Priest of Asclepius, *SEG* 18.19.19–20 of 244/3, and priestess of Athena, *IG* II^2 776.10–13 of 237/6. On the "sacred table" of Asclepius, see Aleshire, 1989.81–2, 108, and 308 and Van Straten, 1995.164–5. That the astynomoi were involved in this, as restored in *SEG* 16.65.11–16 of 272/1, seems unlikely.

67 *SEG* 56.203.6–8 of 286/5 or 214/3.

68 *IG* II^2 1328.8–10 of 183/2 and *IG* II^2 1315.9–12 of 210/9, καλῶς καὶ ἱεροπρεπῶς, οὐθὲν ἐνλείπουσα φιλοτιμίας. I doubt that *Agora* 16.235 is from the cult of the Mother of the Gods. ἱεροπρεπῶς "in a way befitting sacred things" occurs only in *IG* II^2 1315 in the Attic inscriptions (but restored in *Agora* 16.271.5), and notably is in a decree of the cult of the Mother of the Gods and Attis. It may derive from the Asia Minor origins of the cult where the word is found in inscriptions with some frequency. In Attic sources it is otherwise found only in Xen. *Smp*. 8.40, [Pl.] *Thg*. 122e, and Men. *Dysc*. 646.

69 On this text see Behrend, 1970.55–61. On the cult and its location, see Shapiro, 1986 and Humphreys, 2004.227 n. 12.

70 μήτε χάριτος ἕνεκα μὴτ' ἔ[χθρας . . . . . ὡς δι]καιότατα καὶ εὐσεβέστατα. Cf. lines 15–16.

never in the future anything showing a lack of respect (ἀσεβές) may happen concerning the sacred *orgas* and the other sanctuaries at Athens" (51–4).[71]

Sanctuaries or elements of them often need to be repaired or improved, less often to be newly founded. *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #2 of 116/5 offers the fullest account of the religious implications of such repairs. The residents of Salamis honor three individuals who have supervised the repair καλῶς καὶ δικαίως, and they are to be rewarded with crowns of ivy "because of their εὐσέβεια and goodness (καλοκαγαθία) towards the gods" (6–10).[72] The names and contributions of these contributors to the project are to be recorded, "so that, with these things being completed, the things relating to the gods may be καλῶς and εὐσεβῶς for the Demos of the Salaminioi" (14–15).[73] The priest of Apollo at Halai Aixonides repaired the sanctuary [λί]αν φιλοτίμ[ω]ς.[74] In 269/8 a strategos repaired the sanctuary of Nemesis at Rhamnous, "so that it might be in honor and it might be καλῶς and εὐσεβῶς for the demesmen."[75] What is to be "in honor" is no doubt the sanctuary or the goddess, not the strategos. Another strategos at Rhamnous in the last quarter of III BC gave land to soldiers to build a sanctuary of Sarapis and Isis, and in so doing he was "making εὐσέβεια towards the gods of most importance and also goodwill and φιλοτιμία towards his fellow citizens."[76] Members of a *thiasos* of Ammon in 263/2 in an addition to the sanctuary performed work that was "beautiful and worthy of the god (καλὸν καὶ [ἄ]ξιο[ν τ]οῦ [θε]οῦ)" and supervised it [καλῶς καὶ φ]ι[λ]οτίμως."[77] One member of the *thiasos* of the cult of the Mother of the Gods supervised κα[λω]ς καὶ φιλοτίμως the building of an *oikos*.[78] Altars were, of course, the essential part of a

71 [ὅπ]ω[ς] ἃ[ν] ὡς εὐσεβέστατα ἔχει τὰ πρὸς τὸ θεὸ [καὶ μηδέποτ' εἰς τὸν λοιπ]ὸ[ν] χρόνον μηδὲν ἀσεβὲς γίγνητ[αι περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς] ὀ[ργάδος καὶ] περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν τῶν Ἀθ[ήνησιν]. On all matters concerning this text, and on Apollo's ultimate choice that the land should be left unworked, see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.138–43. See also discussion in Lambert, 2012a.61–5, Parker, 2005.91 and 106–7, Engen, 1999, and R&O #58.

72 καλοκαγαθία towards the gods is an unparalleled expression and concept in the Attic inscriptions.

73 ἵνα τούτων συντελουμένων καλῶς ἔχη[ι] καὶ εὐσεβῶς τῶι δήμωι τῶι Σαλαμινίων τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς. Cf. Hesp. 15, #1 of 131/0. On these texts see Deshours, 2011.125–9.

74 R&O #46.1–4 of about 360. λίαν φιλοτίμως is a very odd expression, unparalleled in these Athenian texts and perhaps unsuited to the context.

75 ὅπως εἶ ἐν τιμεῖ καὶ ἔχει καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς τοῖς [δημόταις], *I. Rhamnous* II.3.15–17.

76 περὶ πλείστου ποιούμενος τήν τε πρ[ὸς το]ὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ πολίτας εὔνοιάν τε καὶ φιλοτιμίαν, *I. Rhamnous* II.59.14–19; cf. lines 24–6.

77 *IG* II^2 1282.6–9.

78 *IG* II^2 1273.2–8 of the first half of III BC. On questions of date, see Osborne, 2000.519–20 n. 42. In the same text the priest supervised the sanctuary καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως (28–32).

sanctuary, and the Acharnians in the mid-IV BC, in response to an oracle, built altars of Ares and Athena Areia. The altars were to be built "as well as possible" (ὡς ἄριστα), and the ultimate purpose was "so that the things relating to the gods may be εὐσ[ε]βῶς for Acharnians and Athenians."[79] Epimeletai of a *koinon* of an unknown goddess supervised the sanctuary καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, performed the sacrifices, "adorned" the goddess, and built a new altar, for all of which they were crowned "because of their virtue (ἀρετή) and φιλοτιμία towards the *koinon* and their εὐσέβεια towards the goddess."[80] The tamias of the private cult of Zeus Labraundos was honored by fellow thiasotai for building, "worthily of the god" (ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ), two structures in the sanctuary, clearly spending some of his own money for the projects.[81]

Adorning (ἐπικόσμησις) *of a Sanctuary*

At the end of the second century BC. Sosandrus was commended for his contributions to the "adornment" of gymnasia and sanctuaries, which he did "with no excuses, lacking nothing of seriousness (σπουδή) or of φιλοτιμία." For this he was crowned "because of his εὐσέβεια and technical skill (φιλοτεχνία) concerning the sanctuary and his good will (εὔνοια) towards the Demos of Athenians."[82] About 325 the Eumolpidae honor an individual who supervised the sanctuaries φι[λοτίμως καὶ εὐσεβῶ]ς and "adorned" the sanctuary of Plouton [καλῶς]. He was crowned "because of his εὐσέβεια and φιλοτιμία." He was, the Eumolpidae claim, "serious (σπουδαῖος) . . . about the sanctuaries."[83] To these we may add the fuller account by Hyperides (4.24–5 of ca. 330–324) of how the Athenians, at the oracular request of Zeus of Dodona, "adorned" the statue of Dione there:

> You made made the face as beautiful as possible and all the other things related to it, and you prepared much costly adornment (κόσμος) for the

79 ὅπως [ἀ]ν ἔχῃ ᾽Αχαρνεῦσιν καὶ ᾽Αθ[η]ναίοις εὐσ[ε]βῶς τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, *SEG* 21.519.2–10.

80 ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν καὶ εὐσεβείας τῆς πρὸς τὴν θεόν, *IG* II^2 1277.6–10 and 22–4 of 278/7. On this cult and text see Mikalson, 1998.154–5.

81 *IG* II^2 1271.1–13 of 299/8. Arnaoutoglou (2003.111 n. 81) mistranslates the formula in lines 13–14 as "he performed worthily the duty of the priest of the god." *Agora* 16.218 of 238/7 has been restored to have an architect honored for his oversight of a temple καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως. On this text see Lambert, 2002a.81–2.

82 εὐσεβείας ἕνεκεν καὶ φιλοτεχνίας τῆς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν ᾽Αθηναίων. *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #16.5–9, 15–18. φιλοτεχνία is a rare word in inscriptions, unparalled in Athenian inscriptions, and must refer to some special expertise that Sosandrus contributed. It is often associated with engineering and architecture, as in Hecataeus, *FGrHist* 264 F 25, lines 552, 765, and 854.

83 *I. Eleusis* 93. On which wealthy man this individual might be, see Clinton, 2005–2008. II.104.

goddess . . ., and you adorned (ἐπεκοσμήσατε) the statue of Dione in a way worthy of both yourselves and the goddess.[84]

Supervision* (ἐπιμελεία) *of Sanctuaries

We have already twice seen individuals praised for "supervising" sanctuaries, for doing so καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως and φιλοτίμως καὶ εὐσεβῶς.[85] So, too, Xenocles as epimeletes for the sanctuary of the goddesses and for the Mysteries at Eleusis performed his work [εὐσ]εβῶς and φιλοτίμως.[86] The priest of Asclepius did such work καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς in 328/7.[87] Epimeletai of the cult of Bendis in Piraeus were praised for "supervising" their sanctuary καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως . . ."and worthily of the goddess and of the orgeones."[88] The purpose of such supervision is suggested in *IG* I^3 138.15–17, if we can trust the restorations: [ὅπος ἂν κάλλισ]τα θεραπεύ<ε>ται, "so that it may be served most beautifully." And what is "to be served" is surely the *temenos* of Apollo, supervised by the tamiai and the priest of Apollo.

Dedications

After 277 Heraclitus repaired the Panathenaic stadium and dedicated to Athena Nike paintings representing Antigonus' activities against the barbarians "on behalf of the safety of the Greeks," and for this he was honored by the polis "because of his εὐσέβεια towards the gods and the εὔνοια and φιλοτιμία which he continues to have concerning King Antigonus and the Boule and Demos of Athenians."[89]

In 220/19 the priest of the Heros Iatros approached the Boule with a request to melt down various old dedications in his sanctuary and make from them a silver oinochoe. The Boule proposed to the Ekklesia the appointment of a board of five and two other officials and the priest to manage this and record the names and dedications of the previous dedicators. The new oinochoe is to be ὡς ἂν δύνωνται κάλλιστον, "as beautiful as they are able (to make it)," and the

84 καὶ ὑμεῖς πρόσωπόν τε ποιησάμενοι ὡς οἷόν τε κάλλιστον καὶ τἆλλα πάντα τὰ ἀκόλουθα, καὶ κόσμον πολὺν καὶ πολυτελῆ τῇ θεῷ παρασκευάσαντες . . ., ἐπεκοσμήσατε τὸ ἔδος τῆς Διώνης ἀξίως καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς θεοῦ. On this passage see Rutherford, 2013.118–19 and Whitehead, 2000.223–7. For adorning sanctuaries with marble and bronze statues, see Is. 5.42.

85 *IG* II^2 1277 and *I. Eleusis* 93.

86 *I. Eleusis* 95.10–15 of ca. 321/0.

87 *IG* II^3 359.12–15. Cf. *SEG* 29.135.2–4.

88 καλῶ"ς καὶ φιλοτίμως . . .καὶ ἀξίως τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀργεώνων, Schwenk #52 of 329/8.

89 εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ εὐνοίας καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἧς ἔχων διατε[λεῖ περί] τε [τὸν βασιλέα Ἀντίγονον καὶ] τὴμ βουλ[ὴν καὶ τὸν] δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, *IG* II^2 677. On this text and situation, see Shear, 2001. 600–1 and Mikalson, 1998.164.

purpose of all these arrangements is "so that after these things have happened the things regarding the gods may be καλῶς and εὐσεβῶς for the Boule and the Demos."[90] At the end of the second century a priest of the same god requests of the Boule the repair of several dedications. A similar board is appointed, and again the purpose is "so that with these things being completed the things regarding the gods may be εὐσεβῶς for the Boule and the Demos."[91] An inventory of the dedications in the Chalcothece in 353/2 indicates that the same purpose lay behind being sure that any deficiencies are made up, that is, "so that things regarding the goddess may be κάλλιστα and εὐσεβέστατα."[92]

Finally, *SEG* 52.104.6–8 from Brauron, ca. 300–250, allows us to conclude that buildings as well as other elements were "dedications" in a sanctuary, and here were made, as more commonly sacrifices were, "for the safety of the Demos of Athenians."[93]

Summary for Property of the Gods

The emphasis on εὐσέβεια in almost all activities concerning the property of the gods is notable, comparable only to that of actually performing sacrifices. It is involved in the founding, repairing, adorning, and sometimes even supervising of sanctuaries, the building of altars, and the remaking, repairing, and inventorying of dedications. It is linked with δικαιοσύνη when money or legal matters are involved. εὐσέβεια in these contexts is often associated with "beauty" (κάλλος), and when they are paired, καλῶς or κάλλιστα is always given precedence in position. The major concern, often expressed, concerning the property of the gods was that it be treated "so that the things related to the gods may be (beautiful and) showing proper respect." In most cases both "beauty" and "proper respect for the gods" come into play, but "proper respect" is always there. This is the counterpoint to the fact that *hierosylia*, the stealing

90 ὅπως ἂν τούτων γενομένων ἔχει καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶ[ι] δήμωι τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, *IG* II^3 1154.33–4 and 43–5. On this text see Mikalson, 1998.185–6. Interesting by contrast is Dem. 22.69–78 where the speaker claims that Androtion was made epimeletes for cleaning gold crowns in the polis treasury. Androtion reported that some leaves of them were falling off and apparently was authorized to melt them down and make from them new dedications. He had new *paterae* made, not crowns, which much offended the speaker, and he replaced the original inscriptions, often referring to great men and great accomplishments or to other states honoring Athens, with the phrase, "when Androtion was epimeletes." On this event see Lewis, 1954.39–49.

91 ἵνα τ[ούτων συν]τελουμένων εὐσεβῶς ἔχη[ι τῆι τε βου]λῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι τὰ πρὸς τοὺς [θε]ούς, *IG* II^2 840.28–31.

92 ὅ[π]ω[ς] ἂ[ν] ἔχ[ηι κάλλιστα καὶ ε]ὐσεβέστ[ατα τὰ π]ρὸς τὴν θεόν, *IG* II^2 120.31–2.

93 [ὅσα ἡ] πόλις οἰκοδομήσασα ἀνέθηκεν τῆι θεῶι ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας το[ῦ δ]ήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων.

of sacred property, was considered by many, and especially Plato, as the worst act of *asebeia*.[94]

General Conclusions on Qualifiers of Religious Practices

We here survey the various terms and formulae we have seen used as qualifiers of religious actions and attempt to determine somewhat more precisely their meanings.

καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς ("beautifully and in a manner showing proper respect")

The phrase καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς occurs only in these epigraphical texts, the certain first time in 282/1,[95] but that the phrase must have been already known in the mid-fourth century is suggested by Xenophon, *Mem*. 4.3.16, πῶς οὖν ἄν τις κάλλιον καὶ εὐσεβέστερον τιμῴη θεούς ("How might anyone honor gods more καλῶς and more εὐσεβῶς?") and Demosthenes, 23.29, ὡς καλῶς καὶ σφόδρ' εὐσεβῶς ἔθηκε ὁ τιθεὶς τὸν νόμον ("How καλῶς and really εὐσεβῶς the one who made the law made it."). In fact, nowhere in prior prose or poetic sources is an individual said even to have sacrificed εὐσεβῶς. To sacrifice is itself an act of εὐσέβεια, and in a way "to sacrifice εὐσεβῶς" is tautological, and that may be why "sacrificing εὐσεβῶς" does not occur in the earlier sources. It was, practically and theoretically, possible to sacrifice not εὐσεβῶς, that is, ἀσεβῶς. [Demosthenes] 59.116 offers one example: the hierophant Archias was convicted in court of ἀσέβεια for sacrificing παρὰ τὰ πάτρια ("contrary to ancestral customs"), for making a sacrifice that belonged to the priestess, and for making it on the wrong day. In more theoretical terms, Plato has Euthyphro claim (*Euthphr*. 14b) that if someone knows how in prayer to say and in sacrifice to do things that bring *charis* to the gods, these things are ὅσια ("religiously correct"), and such things preserve private households and the common affairs of cities. The opposites of these things that bring *charis* all do not show εὐσέβεια, and they overturn and destroy all things.[96] Similarly Xenophon (*Mem*. 2.2.13) has Socrates claim that a person who shows no *charis* to his parents, who lacks a sense of *charis*, could not sacrifice εὐσεβῶς. And so, lying behind the εὐσεβῶς of these honorary decrees may be the implication that the individual understands the *charis* relationship with the gods, knows how to sacrifice to preserve that *charis*, follows τὰ πάτρια of the cult, and thus preserves the

94 Mikalson, 2010.166–7.

95 *IG* II^2 668.10–13. It is restored in *Agora* 16.77.8–12 of ca. 334–326 but in an unusual context.

96 On this passage and the terms, see Mikalson, 2010.30 and 170–1.

common interests of the city.[97] But why this should be emphasized or even stated only after 282/1 and only on these official documents remains a mystery. It may be a reflection of the increasingly fulsome praise of the time and the genre.

One could, in sacrifice, attempt to show "proper respect" for the god (εὐσέβεια) but do it in the wrong way (ἀνοσιότης), as we have seen in the case of the hierophant Archias.[98] For a sacrifice to be successful, it must be done both εὐσεβῶς and ὁσίως. ὁσίως ("religiously correctly"), interestingly, though common in earlier prose and poetic texts never occurs in these epigraphical texts,[99] and this suggests one possible meaning of the καλῶς of καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς: καλῶς may have simply come to replace ὁσίως. It may be just the replacement of a specific adverb with a more general one, or, if we wish to maintain the "beauty" inherent in καλῶς, it may possibly be a sign of greater emphasis on the esthetics of sacrifice than on the rules governing it.

Two other possible interpretations of this καλῶς should be mentioned. K. J. Dover (1974.72–3), working with non-epigraphical evidence, described one apparently common meaning of καλῶς when paired with other adverbs: "*Kalos* and *kalôs* seem to have a special function as a reinforcement to other words, so that in saying 'x and *kalos*' I not only communicate the judgment 'x' but also express, and hope to cause in my hearers, a feeling of admiration, as if I had exclaimed parenthetically, 'How splendid!' " If we apply this interpretation to καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, the phrase would mean "splendidly 'showing proper respect' ", or "'showing proper respect' in a manner I approve." But the use of κάλλιον καὶ εὐσεβέστερον by Xenophon (*Mem.* 4.3.16, above) and of καλῶς καὶ σφόδρ' εὐσεβῶς by Demosthenes (23.29, above) do not admit this interpretation, and so we may reasonably deny it for καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς as well.[100]

Veligianni-Terzi (1997.287–92) offers another analysis, using only epigraphic texts and beginning with καλῶς simplex, arguing that in these honorary

97 On *charis* as a fundamental basis for the Greek relationship between humans and gods, see now Jim, 2014.60–8.

98 On this terminology, see Mikalson, 2010.154 and 168.

99 See Appendix 4.

100 Dover (p. 64) recognizes that "when two terms are co-ordinated by 'and,' it is reasonable to expect that each of them says something that the other does not, but," he adds, "it must be confessed that reasonable expectation is often disappointed." Whitehead (1993.67), in a thoughtful consideration of this question, concludes by "imposing a burden of proof upon anyone who wishes to claim that the relationship between the elements in any such pairing was not straightforwardly paratactic (but instead hyponymous, hendiadic or tautologous)." In the pairing of καλῶς with other terms, I would claim that in the cases I treat, but not in all cases, they were paratactic.

texts "καλῶς ist ein Grundbegriff, der die Ausführung eines Amtes oder einer Leiturgie oder bestimmter Aufgaben bewertet. . . ." Here the meaning of καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς would be that X had a task to perform, a sacrifice, and did that task and did it "in a manner showing proper respect." Here it is hard to see what more is added by the καλῶς to the idea that X "sacrificed 'in a manner showing proper respect.' "

In short, two translations of καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς seem possible:

Religiously correctly and in a manner showing proper respect

Beautifully and in a manner showing proper respect[101]

Given the emphasis on the "beauty" of sacrifices, sacrificial victims, and other religious activities previously described and the discussion of The Esthetic Dimension to follow in Chapter 13, I have decided on and used throughout "beautifully and in a manner showing proper respect" for καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς.[102]

εὐσεβῶς εὐσέβεια εὐσεβής ("in a manner showing proper respect," "proper respect," "having proper respect")[103]

The meaning of εὐσεβῶς is fairly clear, without the complexities of the καλῶς. And, importantly, it and its cognates are not used indiscriminately in these epigraphical texts. In addition to the act of sacrifice, they attend the founding of a *heorte* and activities concerning sanctuaries and dedications. They concern sacrifice and the property of the gods, both central and closely tied to the deities themselves. They are not used to commend those who merely supervised religious activities or participated in *pompai* or *agones*. Those individuals were praised in secular terms.[104] Finally, εὐσέβεια was often introduced to honor those who participated in a number of religious activities, always including a sacrifice, as a way to provide a summary commendation.

---

101 I leave out "well and with 'proper respect' " because "well" tells us little. We are, in more general terms, trying to sort out what "to sacrifice well" means, and I think καλῶς holds the key to that.

102 This is not to claim, though, that in all phrases where καλῶς is the first term it should be translated "beautifully." In many other examples Dover's interpretation holds.

103 For "proper respect" and not "piety" for εὐσέβεια, see Mikalson, 2010.9 and *passim*.

104 Here I disagree with Lambert who claims (2012.76) that "*Eusebeia* is a characteristic virtue of a priest, but can be shown by any honorand who is praised for the performance of religious functions."

On Attic inscriptions, interestingly, no one, even on a tombstone, is described by the simple adjective εὐσεβής, "having proper respect," in our period.[105] One may, as we have seen, act εὐσεβῶς and, from 255/4 on, one can "make εὐσέβεια towards the gods of the highest importance" (τὴν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν περὶ πλείστου ποιεῖσθαι). All of these, no doubt in good part because of the medium, are associated with specific actions at a specific time.

To designate an individual εὐσεβής is a moral judgment of a person, not of an action, and perhaps the Athenians preferred not to make such a judgment.[106] I specify Athenians here because a synonymous phrase, εὐσεβῶς ἔχων (or ἔχοντες), was used in other cities for individuals from late III BC on.[107] In Athens individuals may be praised for acting εὐσεβῶς, not for "being εὐσεβεῖς."[108]

---

105 Even mentions of εὐσεβεία are rare on tombstones, all in poems, most involving women (*IG* II^2 6557, 7227, 7863, and 8870).

εὐσεβής is first used regularly in Attic inscriptions of the emperor Antoninus, 138–161 AD, a translation of his Latin title Pius (e.g., *IG* II^2 3394 and *SEG* 17.69). Earlier Ariarathes, King of Cappadocia, also was so designated by the technitai of Dionysus at Athens (*IG* II^2 1330 of 157/6–130). On this text, and on his serving as an agonothetes of the Panathenaia, which may also link him to the technitai in this period, see Aneziri, 2003, #A3 and pp. 45–6 and Shear, 2001.621. As a personal name we have, before II AD, only Eusebes of Pambotadae, ca. 40–17 (*IG* II^2 2338.20 and *Agora* 15.285.6).

106 So, too, no Athenian in the orators is described by the adjective εὐσεβής (Aeschin 2.163 of Demosthenes is sarcastic). Only some Amphissians are so described (Aeschin. 3.19). There is some talk of οἱ εὐσεβεῖς, usually of what they would or would not do (Isoc. 15.322 and frag. 20, Lycurg., *Leoc.* 93. Cf. Hdt. 2.141 and Xen. *Ages.* 11.1 and *Cyn.* 13.17). Elsewhere in the orators the adjective is used of things or actions: of the ψῆφος (Dem. 18.126. Cf. 23.97); of a λόγος (Lycurg. *Leoc.* 1); of γράμματα (Is. 6.49); and of μάχαι (Isoc. 12.182).

The orators are not, however, reticent with ἀσεβής, even of fellow citizens: Demosthenes of Meidias (21. 114. cf. 227), of Aristogiton (25.54 and 63), of Androtion (22.28), of his enemies in Athens (18.241), and what Aeschines might say of the Lacedaemonians and Phocians (19.73); Dinarchus of Demosthenes (1.21); [Lysias] 6.45 of informers, 6.17 of Andocides, and frag. 195.1 [Carey] of Cinesias; Antiphon of accusers (6.33); and Aeschines about the Thirty (2.176). They also speak of οἱ ἀσεβεῖς in general (Isoc. 8.120 and frag. 20, Dem. 24.104 and 25.52–3). They so describe also things and actions: λόγοι (Isoc. 12.203, Dem. 21.104), ἐπιγράμματα (Dem. 22.72 = 24.180), ἔργον (20.126) and πράγματα (19.132).

107 E.g., Delphi (*FD* 3.2.48.4 of 98/7, 49.1–2 of 106, and 50.1–2 of 97 or 106); Magnesia (Rigsby #66.19–20 of 208/7 and #102.56–7); Didyma (*I. Didyma* 142.4–5 of 167–140); Patmus (*I. Patmos* 1.3–4 of 184–100); and Oropus (*I. Oropos* 294.2–4 of 150–100).

108 Verbal and participial forms of εὐσεβ-are not attested in Athenian state documents, the one apparent exception being *SEG* 45.126.7 of ca. 280–240. εὐσεβοῦσι has been restored at *SEG* 18.27.19 where εὐσεβῶς is more probable. For εὐσεβοῦμεν by a *thiasos* in Piraeus, see

On their inscriptions Athenians of the classical and Hellenistic periods did not use the comparative of εὐσεβής, being loath, perhaps, to compare one person's or one city's εὐσέβεια to another's. And they rarely used the superlative, and then only as an adverb. We find εὐσεβέστατα three times in variations of the phrase ὅπως ἂν ὡς εὐσεβέστατα ἔχῃ (τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς),[109] and twice in relation to voting and taking oaths.[110] All are in the context of managing dedications and sanctuaries, not about named individuals. All are also from mid-IV BC or earlier. The hesitation to use the comparatives and superlatives of εὐσεβής is similar in the literary texts, but the contexts are more revealing. The comparative is first attested in Aeschylus, *Cho*. 139–41 where Electra prays to her father that she be σωφρονεστέρα and εὐσεβεστέρα than her mother, but this can hardly imply that she thought Clytemestra was σώφρων and εὐσεβής. Euripides in *Or*. 627–8 has Tyndareus advise Menelaus not to choose friends who are δυσσεβεῖς, thrusting aside those who are εὐσεβέστεροι. Elsewhere the true comparative force comes through. In Euripides, frag. 327 [Nauck] the speaker offers a common sentiment, "I see that those (poor people) sacrificing small offerings to gods are εὐσεβέστεροι than those rich people sacrificing cows." That is, the rich, when they sacrifice, are εὐσεβεῖς, but the poor with their humble offerings are εὐσεβέστεροι. In a similar manner Xenophon (*Mem*. 4.3.16) has Socrates ask, "How might anyone honor the gods κάλλιον καὶ εὐσεβέστερον than by doing it as the gods themselves bid?" Others might sacrifice, in our usual phrase, καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς. So, too, Aeschines the philosopher (frag. 8.61–2 [Dittmar]) claims τοῖς καλοῖς κἀγαθοῖς εὐσεβεστέροις γε οὖσι ἄμεινα τὰ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ὑπάρχειν ("For those who are good and noble, if they εὐσεβέστεροι, the things from the gods are better").[111] Xenophon (*Mem*. 4.3.18) has Socrates making those with him εὐσεβέστεροι καὶ σωφρονέστεροι. Not to be missed in all of this, even including Demosthenes' rants against Philip, is that individual Greek states, including Athenians, did not claim to defeat or be able to defeat their

---

IG II^2 1275.10. For the occurrences of εὐσέβεια and cognates in other texts from private religious associations, see Arnaoutoglou, 2003.116–117.

109 *IG* I^3 84.8 of 418/7, *IG* II^2 120.31–2 of 353/2, and *IG* II^3 292.51–2 of 352/1.

110 *IG* II^3 292.10 and 15–16 of 352/1. Cf. *SEG* 36.187.8.

111 Other examples from the period include Isocrates 9.39 and Antiphon *Tetra*. 3.4.1. An interesting example from outside our period is Diod. S. 5.49.6, of the Eleusinian Mysteries, γίνεσθαι δέ φασι καὶ εὐεσβεστέρους καὶ δικαιοτέρους καὶ κατὰ πᾶν βελτιόνας ἑαυτῶν τοὺς τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνήσαντας ("They say that those who have shared in the Mysteries become εὐσεβέστεροι and δικαιότεροι and in everything better than themselves.").

enemies because they were εὐσεβέστεροι than their enemies, an important and perhaps distinctive feature of Greek religion.[112]

In reference to individuals the superlative εὐσεβέστατος occurs first in tragedians, especially Euripides. He links it to Athenian jurors, as do the orators.[113] Isocrates describes the Athenians as πρὸς τὰ τῶν θεῶν εὐσεβέστατα διακειμένους (4.33). Xenophon ups the ante, from comparative to superlative, to Aeschines' statement above, having Socrates think that τοὺς θεοὺς ταῖς παρὰ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων τιμαῖς μάλιστα χαίρειν ("The gods find *charis* especially in the honors from the εὐσεβέστατοι.") (*Mem.* 1.3.3).[114] In all of these reference is to a group. Xenophon was the first to apply the superlative to a contemporary individual, Socrates (1.1.20).[115] Most individuals who are praised in these texts as εὐσεβέστατοι are royalty, mostly of myth, perhaps not surprising in tragedy (Neoptolemus in S. *Ph.* 85, Pittheus in E. *Med.* 684, Strophius in *El.* 886–7, Chiron in *IA* 926–7) but also in historians (Alcimus in Xanthus, *FGrHist* 765 F 10 and Anacharsis in Ephorus, *FGrHist* 70 F 158).[116] The link to royalty brings us to one of the earliest occurrences in all inscriptions, Attalus II's description of his mother as εὐσεβεστάτη γενομένη πασῶμ.[117] And all this may suggest the origins of the later common practice, but not in Athens, of praising monarchs, Roman emperors, and such as εὐσεβέστατος. It was appropriate for kings and emperors, not for the common man.

τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς ("the things relating to the gods")[118]

Isocrates and Aristotle give some indication of what it meant that τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς were εὐσεβῶς and καλῶς. In his advice to Demonicus (1.13), Isocrates recommends,

---

112 The one counter-example comes from Demosthenes' response to Philip's letter (11.16), probably spurious.

113 Eur. *El.* 1362–3. Cf. *Or.* 1650–2 where, according to Apollo, the gods will render εὐσεβεστάτην ψῆφον for Orestes in Athens. In Antiphon 6.51, if the passage is genuine, the εὐσεβέστατοι Athenian jurors are contrasted to the ἀνοσιώτατοι prosecutors, all in the context of oaths. Dinarchus (1.87) has Athenian jurors claim that they are πάντων εὐσεβέστατοι.

114 Cf. Isoc. 15.282.

115 Menander has Demeas use it of his son concerning his behavior towards his father (*Sam.* 274). Other occurrences are in Eur. *Hel.* 1632, Xen. *Cyn.* 13.17, and Isoc. 12.163. In Aesop #285.12 it is said is of a stork!

116 In Ephorus we have, uniquely, a hyper-superlative: τῶν σφόδρα εὐσεβεστάτων.

117 *I. Pergamon* 248.46. Also probably from this period but not dated: from Anaphe, *IG* XII.3.27 of a priest of Sarapis and Isis; from Metropolis, *SEG* 32.1167.4 of a member of the cult of Ares; and from Arcesine, *IG* XII.7.49 of a benefactress of the city.

118 The full phrase, though not attested on Athenian inscriptions, was probably τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς ἀνήκοντα, as in *FD* 3.2.48.4–5 and 3.2.49.2.

> First show proper respect in the things relating to the gods, not only by sacrificing but also by remaining true to your oaths. The former is an indication that you are well provided with money, the latter is evidence of the goodness of your character. Honor the divine (τὸ δαιμόνιον) always, but especially with your city. For in this way you will seem to be at the same time sacrificing to the gods and remaining true to your oaths.

Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* (1383a–b), in describing why people are "courageous" or "confident" (θαρραλέοι), includes, "if in general the things relating to the gods are καλῶς for them, both the other things and the things from omens and oracles."[119] Sacrifices, maintenance of oaths, and, what is a particular concern in our texts, successful divinination are indicators that τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς are καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς.[120]

φιλοτίμως φιλοτιμία ("in a manner showing a love of honor," "love of honor")

φιλοτίμως, "in a manner showing a love of honor," is, in the phrase καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, the most common commendation of religious activities. Whitehead, who did the foundational study of the concept of φιλοτιμία,[121] translates it "with a love of honor." Here it is δημοσία φιλοτιμία, "φιλοτιμία involving the Demos," as specified in Demosthenes 18.257 and Aeschines 1.129. The type of "honor" which is loved is described as follows by Aristotle in the *Nicomachaean Ethics* (8.1163b3–8): τιμή is the prize for virtue and benefactions, and "the one who provides no good to the community is not held in honor, because a communal thing is given to the one who benefits the community, and honor is that communal thing."[122] Relevant here is the sentiment Thucydides has Pericles express in the Funeral Oration (2.44.4), "Love of honor (τὸ φιλότιμον) alone is ageless, and in the useless time of life (i.e., old age), earning a profit does not delight more, as some say, but being honored (τὸ τιμᾶσθαι)."

Demosthenes in court, in his prosecution of Meidias for assaulting him when he was a choregos, claims that the jurors ought to judge φιλοτιμία not if someone builds a house in an illustrious way (λαμπρῶς) or owns many servant

---

119 For θαρρεῖν in a similar context, see Xen. *Mem.* 4.3.17.

120 For divination see Chapter 4. In literary texts as contrasted to epigraphical ones τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς is often associated with ὁσιότης: e.g., Antiphon 5.82, Aeschin. 3.120, and Philoch., *FGrHist* 328 F 12.

121 For the development of the concept of φιλοτιμία and its political and social role in this period, see Whitehead, 1983 and 1986.241–52, Wilson, 2000.187–94, Hakkarainen, 1997, Sinclair, 1988.188–90, and Dover, 1974.230–4 and 236. For it in state honorary inscriptions, see Lambert, 2011.

122 Cf. Socrates in Xen. *Mem.* 3.6.3, "Is it not clear that if you wish to be honored you must benefit the city?" For the context, see Hakkarainen, 1997.3.

girls or lots of beautiful furniture, but the man who is illustrious and φιλότιμος in those things in which all share (21.159). In his discussion of this passage MacDowell (1990.378–9) offers a good summary account of the various aspects of φιλοτιμία: "Literally 'love of honour,' the word refers not only to a state of mind but also to an activity undertaken for the purpose of gaining honour; and honour (τιμή) means praise, admiration, deference, and sometimes material rewards, given by other people in acknowledgement of such activity successfully undertaken."

The recently discovered honors (*SEG* 56.203) to Bacchis, the ἐπιμελήτρια ("female supervisor") of the *thiasos* of Agathe Thea, probably of 214/3, offer a good explication of how φιλοτιμία in religious matters was sometimes viewed: Bacchis is honored "so that it may be a matter of competition (ἐφάμιλλον) for all those wishing to show φιλοτιμία in the association, knowing that they will receive return favors (χάριτες) worth what they show φιλοτιμία in."[123] It was treated as a "competition" (ἐφάμιλλον), and the nature of the χάριτες ἄξιαι are revealed in the next lines: the thiasotai are to praise Bacchis, to give her a crown of ivy "because of her εὐσέβεια towards the gods and her φιλοτιμία towards themselves," and the hieropoioi are publicly to announce the crown.[124]

Bacchis, in her role, also contributed her own money (lines 6–11), but we should not assume "financial generosity" behind most commendations for φιλοτιμία.[125] Many individuals are praised for their φιλοτιμία in sacrifices and other religious activities. Some contributed their own money for these activities, but most did not.[126] Rather, they just performed their religious task in a way that would bring them the civic honor they "loved," and the honoring decrees themselves, the crowns, and other such awards are the indication that they accomplished this.[127]

---

123 ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐφάμιλλον ᾖι πᾶσι τοῖς βουλομένοις [ἐν] τεῖ συνόδῳ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι εἰδόσιν ὅτι χάριτας ἀξίας κομ[ι]οῦνται ὧν φιλοτιμηθῶσιν. This clause or slight variants of it, common in honorary inscriptions, was used also in honors of several other officials involved in religious activities. On these and on such hortatory clauses in general, see Chapter 12.

124 Cf. *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #1.20–21 of 131/0, a decree honoring a gymnasiarch for his religious activities, where we have εἰδόσιν ὅτι καταξίως τιμηθήσονται ("knowing that they will be honored in a worthy way"). Also *IG* II^2 1292.17–19 of 215/4, a decree of the Sarapiastae.

125 A common error, which I, too, have made regularly, as in translating the phrase καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως in *Agora* 15.78.12 and *IG* II^3 1284.14 and throughout my *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (1998.113, 198, and *passim*) as "well and generously," wrong, I now think, for both καλῶς and φιλοτίμως.

126 Contrary to what Hakkarainen (1997) seems to assume. See Chapter 5.

127 μεγαλοπρεπῶς is the adverb indicating specifically financial generosity for public purposes, including religious activities. See discussion in Chapter 13.

Whitehead (1986.241), following Dover, translates καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως "with a fine love of honor," treating καλῶς "as a reinforcement" to φιλοτίμως. The meaning "beautifully and showing a love of honor," which I would prefer, is more difficult here, largely because the phrase is used in praise of many officials and individuals whose activities would seem to allow little opportunity to display "beauty."[128] But we should consider how often, in the fourth century, φιλοτιμία is linked to τὰ καλά even in profane matters, as in Plato, *Smp*. 178d, when Phaedrus, in response to the question of what ought to guide men who intend to live καλῶς, answers "αἰσχύνη at τὰ αἰσχρά and φιλοτιμία at τὰ καλά," for without these it is not possible for a city or an individual to accomplish deeds that are great and καλά. One can see here, as probably in our texts, the coexistence of both esthetic and moral concepts: what is αἰσχρόν is ugly and bad, what is καλόν is beautiful and good, and shame (αἰσχύνη) is linked to the former, φιλοτιμία to the latter.[129] There may well have been for the performance of most or all religious and even profane duties an esthetic element that escapes us, an element captured in the καλῶς of καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως.

εὐσέβεια καὶ φιλοτιμία ("proper respect" and "love of honor")

εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας is widely used from 284/3 on[130] as a summary commendation for those who have performed sacrifices, often in conjunction with other religious services.[131] It, like several other phrases considered, occurs

128 See, e.g., Veligianni-Terzi, 1997.289–292.

129 Cf. Lysias 14.42–43, Aeschin. 1.160, and Arist. *EN* 4.1125b.

130 The earliest attestation is *IG* II² 1163.17–20. Clinton (1974, H5, pp. 18–20, lines 20–22) restores the phrase in the honors of the hierophant Hieroklides in mid-IV BC, but alternative restorations are possible. See, e.g., *IG* II² 1188.20–2.

131 Priests and priestesses: of Zeus Soter (*IG* II² 690.7–9), of Kalliste (*IG* II² 788.23–5), of Asclepius (*IG* II² 1163.14–22, *SEG* 18.19.20–4 and 18.22.16–20), and of Demeter (*IG* II³ 1189.1–3). Here two variants are noteworthy. A priestess of Aglauros receives a crown only because of her εὐσέβεια, with no mention of φιλοτιμία (*SEG* 33.115). Likewise a priestess of Athena Polias was honored only for her εὐσέβεια, but later in the text her husband is honored for both his εὐσέβεια and φιλοτιμία (*IG* II² 776.20–6 and 26–30). The priestess' φιλοτιμία, if the restoration is correct, concerned only the goddess (lines 14–16). Perhaps in some circumstances φιλοτιμία was not thought appropriate for a woman! For more on this, see The Social Dimension in Chapter 13.
Epimeletai of the Mysteries: *I. Eleusis* 181.25–9 and *IG* II³ 1188.31–33 and 1164.46–8. Other epimeletai: *IG* II² 676.30–3, *IG* II³ 1284.38–41, and *SEG* 56.203.19–21.
Agonothetes: *IG* II² 780.18–20.
Archon and *paredroi: IG* II² 668.17–22.
Prytaneis and their tamias: numerous examples in *Agora* 15, e.g., 78.14–16 of 273/2 (the earliest in the prytany decrees), 86.14–17, and *IG* II³ 1165.17–20 and 1263.17–19.

only in these texts. In fact even εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα by itself occurs only twice in other earlier or contemporary prose and poetry, in one author.[132] When fully expressed, the εὐσέβεια of this phrase is directed to the gods, the φιλοτιμία towards the relevant community—whether it be the polis, the deme, or a private religious association.[133] We have discussed already the individual terms, but note here that εὐσέβεια is always given precedence over φιλοτιμία and that, because of the εὐσέβεια, it commends only those who have sacrificed or have been directly involved with the property of the gods.[134]

Some may reasonably see in the Athenians' regular praise of individuals or groups τῆς εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα an indication that they are attributing to them the status of being εὐσεβεῖς.[135] I would make the distinction, perhaps too fine, that rather than describing a permanent moral status, τῆς εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα is closely linked to the time and act(s) for the individuals who are honored,

---

Strategos: *I. Rhamnous* 11.59.23–6, by Sarapiastae for having given them land for their sanctuary at Rhamnous.

Ephebes: only once, *IG* II^3 1166.29–31. The absence in the several other ephebic decrees is noteworthy. Perhaps for them, too, φιλοτιμία was not thought appropriate.

Most interesting is *IG* II^3 1150.3–5 and 7–9 of 224/3–222/1, wherein the Ephesians honor the Athenians and the Athenians in turn honor the Ephesians, both εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας.

132 Antiphon, *Tetra*. 2.3.12 and *Orat*. 6.7.

133 If the restorations are correct, the priestess of Athena Polias shows φιλοτιμία to the deity (*IG* II^2 776.14–16). In *I. Eleusis* 70.9–11 a foreigner showed φιλοτιμία "towards the gods and the Demos of Athenians and of the Eleusinians." In *SEG* 18.22.18–20 a priest of Asclepius also apparently shows εὐσέβεια *and* φιλοτιμία towards the gods, but this is probably a misuse of the usual formula, as also in *SEG* 18.24.10–12. Clinton restores *I. Eleusis* 234.6 to have, uniquely, the εὐσέβεια directed to the *genos* of the Eumolpidae, but note a different restoration in *IG* II^2 1045.7.

134 If εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας first appears in 282/1 as a summary commendation for sacrificing and other religious activities, we might ask what, if any, terms of praise were used before this time. ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας might seem a candidate. The phrase is used to commend taxiarchs in 271/0 (*Agora* 16.187.27–30), a strategos in 293/2 (*SEG* 45.101.37–40), a choregos in 326/5 (Schwenk #65.7–11), and is restored for a syllogeus in 324/3 (Schwenk #77.7–10). Each had performed religious services, but all but the choregos had performed many non-religious services as well, and the summary commendation clearly refers to their whole contribution, not just their religious activities. On ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας and some of these texts, see Veligianni-Terzi, 1997.221.

135 It is worth noting that neither Athenians nor others are attested to have been praised as individuals τῆς ὁσιότητος ἕνεκα. See Appendix 4.

i.e., "because of the 'proper respect' towards the gods which they showed on these occasions."

The phrase εὐσέβεια καὶ φιλοτιμία nicely captures and represents a fundamental duality of purpose and audience for virtually all actions concerning sacrifices or sanctuaries. εὐσέβεια is directed to the gods, φιλοτιμία towards members of one's own community. Both are there, but, because of the usual priority of the gods, εὐσέβεια comes first. But the fundamental point is that here and in virtually all the religious actions we see described throughout this study the focus is simultaneously on the gods and on one's own community, whether it be fellow citizens, fellow demesmen, or fellow members of a private cult. In these texts religious acts are virtually always directed to both the gods and the members of one's community.[136]

εὐσέβεια καὶ δικαιοσύνη ("proper respect" and "honesty")[137]

In the orators εὐσεβής and δίκαιος and their cognates are regularly paired, but not on Athenian polis documents.[138] The one exception, however, is revealing. In *IG* II^3 292 of 352/1 the fifteen members of an ad hoc committee to determine the boundaries of the Sacred Orgas are to swear an oath, and various officials are to be there as witnesses that they swear this oath [ὡ]ς εὐσεβέστατα καὶ δικαιότατα. The oath is to be that they will vote [ὡς δι]καιότατα καὶ εὐσεβέστατα (5–16). The oath involves εὐσέβεια towards the gods and also δικαιοσύνη because legal and financial issues are involved. The voting involves, obviously, δικαιοσύνη but also εὐσέβεια if, as here, the voter has sworn an oath to vote δικαίως.[139] Inscriptions from Attic demes and private associations reveal another context for the pairing of εὐσεβῶς and δικαίως, when an official in the course of performing religious actions has also handled financial or legal matters.[140] Here the distinction is sometimes made, and is everywhere

136 For more on this, see The Social Dimension in Chapter 13.

137 Dihle (1968) has treated this pair in a short but very rich monograph entitled *Der Kanon der zwei Tugenden*. There he traces this pair and describes the changes of meanings of the terms from earliest Greek poetry through Vulgärethik (using some of our texts) and philosophy into Judaic and early Christian writings.

138 The usual order is εὐσέβεια first, then δικαιοσύνη. Reversals of this order may have a rhetorical purpose, as in Lycur. *Leoc*. 1.

139 Cf. Dem. 23.97. For εὐσέβεια explicitly or probably associated with jurors keeping their oath, see Lysias, frag. 426 [Carey], Din. 1.84, and Dem. 18.7 and 126, 22.97, 24.34, and 39.41.

140 Deme, R&O #46.8–9 of ca. 360. Tribe, *IG* II^2 1163.17–20 of 284/3. A *koinon, IG* II^2 1278.11–13 of ca. 277/6. The context of *IG* II^2 1330.5–6, the technitai of Dionysus praising King Ariarathes and his son, is not clear.

probably implicit, that the εὐσέβεια is directed to the gods, the δικαιοσύνη to humans, whether they be fellow citizens, fellow demesmen, or, as here, fellow tribesmen: "because of their εὐσέβεια towards the gods and their δικαιοσύνη and φιλοτιμία towards their fellow tribesmen and the Demos of Athenians" (*IG* II^2 1163.17–20 of 284/3).[141] These three contexts explain most examples of the pairings of εὐσεβής and δίκαιος and their cognates in Athenian inscriptions and in the orators.[142] Isocrates, however, occasionally launches into broader treatments of virtue in general, and here he gives us welcome statements of the benefits from the conjunction of εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη:

> It is strange if they have not realized that we are εὐσεβεῖς in matters regarding the gods and we practice δικαιοσύνη and the other virtues not so that we may have less than other people but so that we may spend our lives with most good things (3.2).
>
> I am surprised if someone thinks that those who practice εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη persevere and remain in them, expecting that they will have less than wicked people but not believing that with both the gods and humans they will get more than other people (8.33).
>
> I see . . . that those who live with εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη both live safely in present times and have hopes that are sweeter about all time (8.34).
>
> I said a little before what those who intend to have *eudaimonia* must have, and they are εὐσέβεια, σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, and the rest of virtue (8.63).

Such are the benefits from εὐσέβεια καὶ δικαιοσύνη: to get more than others; to live with the most "good things," safely, and with "sweeter hopes" about all time; in short, to enjoy *eudaimonia*.[143]

We offer here a list of additional, less frequent terms and phrases that were used to commend those who participated in religious activities.

---

141 This distinction is also made explicit in Din. 1.84, Isoc. 12.124 and 204, and Xen. *Mem*. 4.8.11.

142 For other contexts see [Lysias] 6.12, Antiph. 6.51 and *Tetra*. 2.2.12, and Aeschin. 2.163.

143 In the philosophical tradition, as, e.g., Pl. *Euthyph*. 2b, εὐσέβεια can be treated as one part of δικαιοσύνη, that part directed to the gods. See Mikalson, 2011.28, 31, and 185–207.

περὶ πλείστου ποιούμενοι τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν ("making εὐσέβεια towards the gods of most importance")—for activities, including sacrifices, of priests, priestesses, an agonothetes, a strategos, and theoroi; for giving land to build a sanctuary; for instituting a new torchrace; and as τὸ πάτριον ἔθος of the Athenians.[144]

οὐθὲν ἐλλείπων ("lacking nothing of")

σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ("effort and φιλοτιμία")—for improvement of sanctuary[145]

φιλοτιμίας—for spreading couch for Attideia, private cult[146]

σπουδῆς—for giving prizes for Theseia *agones*[147]

προθυμίας ("eagerness")—concerning sanctuaries (Lysias 12.99)

τῶν ἀναγκαίων ("the necessary things")—ephebic service in sacrifices[148]

---

144 *IG* II^2 776. 21–22 of 237/6, 780.12–13 of 252/1, *SEG* 18.19. 16–17 of 244/3, *I. Rhamnous* II.22. 5–6 of 229/8, 23. 2–3 of 229/8, and 59. 14–19 of last quarter of III BC, *MDAI* 66. 228. #4. 10–11 of 138/7, *SEG* 21.469C. 4–5 of 129/8, and *IG* II^2 1054. 20–1 of ca. 125–100. For literary texts, see similar phrases in Is. 6.49 and Isoc. 8.135. In epigraphical texts this phrase has a limited but interesting distribution. Apart from the Athenian examples, the earliest of which is 252/1, nine are found at Delphi, the earliest being of 189/8 and one being a decree of the Aetolian League. Three derive from Delos, all of early II BC and all are virtually identical to the Delphic texts of ca. 70 years earlier. The dates would suggest that Athens provided the phrase and that Delphi built it into boilerplate which Delos then copied (Delphi: *FD* 3.2.89.4–5, 3.118.6–7, 3.147.9–11, 3.240.8, 4.56.5–6, 4.57.8–9, 4.161.6–7, 4.171.5, 6.4.8–9, *SGDI* 2677, all of II BC, the earliest of which is *SGDI* 2677 of 189/8. Delos: *IG* XI.4.765.5–6, 776.6–9 (with an odd genitive τῆς . . . εὐσεβείας), 792.5–6, both of early II BC. Other examples, from Asia Minor and neighboring areas and perhaps influenced by Delos, are from Imbrus (*IG* XII.8.52.4–6), Cyzicus (Rigsby, #161.10–11), and Cnidus (*I. Knidos* 1.220. Comm. 22–3), all of II BC. An outlier, though, a Samothracian decree of the 280's honoring King Lysimachus for punishing those who robbed and attempted to burn their sanctuary, claims he did this περὶ [πλ]εί[σ]του ποιούμενος τὴμ πρὸς τοὺς [θε]οὺς εὐσέβειαν (*IG* XII.8.150.17–19). This already has the ring of a formula and casts doubt on the Athenian origins of the use of this phrase in a religious context. Inscriptions using this phrase are, understandably, almost all honorary, and εὐσέβεια is included in the praise because the individual benefited *both* a city *and* its sanctuary. The sanctuary, in the Greek religious tradition, is always named first, as in περί τε τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὸν δῆμον of *IG* XI.4.776.5–6 or ποτὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὰν πόλιν of *FD* 3.3.118.6 of Delphi. In others specific religious actions are described.

145 *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #16.8–9, end of II BC.

146 *IG* II^2 1315.11–12 of 210/9.

147 *IG* II^2 956.10 of 161/0 and 958.8–9 of 153/2.

148 *SEG* 15.104.20, 87 of 127/6.

In general, Xenophon, *Mem*. 4.3.17: "If one lacks nothing (μηδὲν ἐλλείποντα) in honoring the gods so far as he can, he ought to be confident (θαρρεῖν) and hope for the greatest good things."

εὐσχημόνως ("with good form")[149]—of participation in sacrifices, *pompai, agones*, and the ἄρσεις τῶν βοῶν, and of fulfillment of religious duties by priests and others.[150]

ἐπάνδρως ("in a manly way")—of ephebes' participation in *agones* or the "liftings of the cows."[151]

ἀξίως (ἄξιον) τῶν θεῶν **("worthily of the gods")**

Or, better, since we are working with cult and not with generalities about the divine world,[152] **ἀξίως (ἄξιον) τῆς θεᾶς (θεοῦ)**. ἀξίως τῆς θεᾶς (θεοῦ) is used of the performance of priestly offices, of the adornment of a statue, the holding of a Pythaïs and a *pannychis*, and in private cults of the performance of epimeletai, of a *pompe*, and of construction in a sanctuary.[153] ἄξιον τοῦ θεοῦ describes a building project in the sanctuary of Ammon and a bull that the ephebes in 122/1 sent for the Dionysia.[154] For its relationship to the "beauty" of Greek religion, see The Esthethic Dimension in Chapter 13.

---

149 Translated by others as "properly," "de digne manière," "en bon ordre."

150 Of ephebic participation in *agones*, ἄρσις βοῶν, or *pompai: IG* II^3 1176.15 of 203/2; 1166.13 of 212/1; 1256.9–10 of 196/5; 1313.87–8 of 175/4; Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.14 of 122/1; 1008.12 of 118/7; and 1029.9 of 94/3. Of fulfilling religious duties, of hierophant, *IG* II^2 1235.8–9 of ca. 274/3; of prytaneis, *Agora* 15.240.9 of 140/39; and of epimeletes of citizen orgeones of Bendis, *IG* II^2 1324.9–10 of early II BC.

151 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.78–9 of 122/1. Cf. *SEG* 22.110.22 of 79/8 and *IG* II^2 1043.25 and 27 of 37/6 (?).

152 For the difference between the two as exemplified in the use of θεοί, see Mikalson, 2003.131–3 and 139.

153 Of polis cults: *SEG* 18.19.20 of 244/3, of a *pannychis* for Asclepius; *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #3.2–5 of 106/5, of the Pythaïs; and Hyp. 4.25, ca. 330–324, of adornment of statue of Dione. For deme cult: R&O #46, ca. 360, of performance of priestly office for Apollo Zoster. For private cults: Schwenk #52.5–6, 329/8, of activities of epimeletai of orgeones of Bendis; *IG* II^2 1324.5, early II BC, of a *pompe* of Bendis; and 1271.7, 299/8, of construction in a sanctuary of Zeus Labraundos. Cf. Pl. *Smp*. 180d, of praising Eros.

154 *IG* II^2 1282.7–8 of 263/2 and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.13 of 122/1.

For some phrases praising religious behavior used elsewhere, but not at Athens, see Appendix 4.

A final item of interest because it is so unusual is that the Athenians once honored the *god* Amphiaraus with a crown because καλῶς ἐπιμελεῖται Athenians and others who come to his sanctuary "for health and safety." The crown itself is dedicated "for the health and safety of the Demos of Athenians and their children and wives and all those in the land" (*IG* II^3 349 of 332/1). Here the Athenians are caught up in their own formulae and, uniquely, have a god "supervising" humans and award him a crown for that.[155]

155 Uniquely, if we leave aside philosophical writings such as, e.g., Pl. *Phd.* 62b7, *Lg.* 10.905d.2–3 and 907 b5–6, Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.19, 1.4.14, 4.3.12 and *Smp.* 4.48, and Arist. *EN* 10.1179a24–5. For attempts to explain the anomaly of this text, see Scafuro, 2009 and Meyer, 2013.490.

CHAPTER 2

The Good Priests and Priestesses

Priests and Priestesses Praised

Our epigraphical texts are virtually the only source for the praise of priests and priestesses in classical and Hellenistic Athens.[1] And in these texts, from the beginning down to the Roman period, the Athenian polis praised only nine priests and priestesses on at most seventeen occasions.[2] They are the priestesses of Aglauros, Athena Polias, and Demeter, and the priests of Ammon, Asclepius (eight times), Dionysus and Poseidon Pelasgios (both of Piraeus), Kalliste, and Zeus Soter (three times).[3] Demesmen honored four priests and priestesses: of Halai Aixonides, the priest of Apollo Zoster; of Aixone, the priest of the Heraclidae and the priestess of Hebe and Alcmene; and of Melite, the priestess of the Thesmophoroi. To those above are to be added priests of Amphiaraus who were honored twice, about 200 years apart, first by the Boule and then by the citizens of Oropus.[4] The Mesogeioi honored both a priest of Heracles and one of Diomus.[5] The hierophant was honored both by demesmen of Eleusis and by the *gene* Kerykes and Eumolpidae, and that priesthood is the

1 Praises are not to be found in the prose and poetric sources, and only criticisms are to be found in Aristophanes (e.g., *Av*. 848–903 and *Plut*. 676–81). For the treatment of priests in the philosophical tradition, see Mikalson, 2010.101–7.

2 For crowns and other public honors awarded to priestesses, see Connelly, 2007.203–13 and, more generally on state priests and priestesses, Lambert, 2012. On priestesses and on the procedures for appointment and on the tenure of priests and priestesses, see Horster, 2010 and 2012, Parker, 1996.125–30, and Garland, 1984. For a study of honorary decrees by the Athenian polis for Athenian priests at Athens and on Delos from 167–88 BC, see Perrin-Saminadayar, 2012.

3 Aglauros, *SEG* 33.115 of 250/49; Athena Polias, *IG* II^2 776 of 237/6; Demeter, *IG* II^3 1189.3 of ca. 215; Ammon, *IG* II^3 416 of 340–330; Asclepius, often, see below; Dionysus and Poseidon Pelasgios in Piraeus, *IG* II^3 416; Kalliste, *IG* II^2 788 of 235/4 (?); and Zeus Soter, *IG* II^2 690 and Lambert, 2012.99–100, #6. On the priestesses of Athena Polias and of Demeter at Eleusis, see Connelly, 2007.59–69.

4 *I. Oropos* 290 of ca. 369/8 and 294 of 150–100.

5 Apollo Zoster, R&O #46 of ca. 360; Heraclidae, Hebe, and Alcmene, *IG* II^2 1199.22–8 of 320/19; Thesmophoroi, *Agora* 16.227 of early II BC; and Heracles and Diomus, *IG* II^2 1247 of mid-III BC.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_004

only one to be recognized by two distinct groups.[6] The *genos* of the Theonidai honored their priestess of Nymphe.[7] The *koinon* of the Mother of the Gods in Piraeus was the longest lasting of such *koina*, and it voted honors for its priestesses in 272/1, 212/1, and 210/9.[8] Only two other *koina* voted such honors, and quite late: for the priest of the Theoi Megaloi in 111/0 and for the priestess of Syrian Aphrodite in 97/6.[9]

Priestly Duties, from the Inscriptions[10]

The priest of Asclepius of the City Asclepieion was the priest most often honored, eight times in reasonably complete texts, from 328/7 to 137/6, and again as often in heavily restored texts.[11] This may seem a lot, but perhaps not so if we consider that approximately 350 men are estimated to have held the priesthood from ca. 350–25 BC, 112 of whom are known by name.[12] From these texts we have a more complete picture of his duties than of any other Athenian priest. First and foremost, he sacrificed to Asclepius, Hygieia, and the other gods "for the health and safety" of the Boule, Demos, and other individuals of concern at the time, and he reported the results to the Boule.[13] He also sacrificed at the Asclepieia, Epidauria, and Heroa. He supervised the sanctuary and was responsible for εὐκοσμία there. Once it is said that he sacrificed the εἰσιτητήρια, probably at the beginning of his year of service. He also adorned a table, spread a couch, and held the *pannychides* for Asclepius. He was involved

6 By Eleusinians, *I. Eleusis* 72 of mid-IV BC; by Kerykes and Eumolpidae, *I. Eleusis* 236 of ca. 140 and 234 of ca. 150.

7 *SEG* 29.135.

8 *IG* II^2 1316, 1314, and 1315. On this *koinon* see Mikalson, 1998.142–3, 203–4.

9 Theoi Megaloi, *Agora* 16.325; Syrian Aphrodite, *IG* II^2 1337. On these cults see Mikalson, 1998. 254 and 277–8.

10 For duties of priests and priestesses in general, see Flower, 2015.295–7 and Connelly, 2007; on Athenian state priestesses, Lambert, 2012. R&O #27 of 386–374 gives a full account of the expectations for the priest of Amphiaraus at Oropus, in a period when Oropus was independent from Athenian control. For the complex history of Oropus as a possession, or not, of Athens, see Deshours, 2011.173.

11 Reasonably complete texts: *IG* II^3 359, *IG* II^2 1163, *SEG* 18.19, *IG* II^3 1386, *SEG* 18.22, *IG* II^2 976, *SEG* 18.26. See also *SEG* 18.27. For all matters concerning the priest of Asclepius of the City Asclepieion, see Aleshire, 1989. *passim* but esp. 72–86.

12 Aleshire, 1989.53–4.

13 See Chapter 4.

in the repair of dedications. Once he even contributed to the εὐκοσμία in the theater and once supervised the allotment of jurors, perhaps those of his own tribe. Euthydemus, a priest of Asclepius in Piraeus, decided which *prothymata* were to be sacrificed there.[14] The priest of Apollo Erithaseos announced regulations against cutting and taking wood and such things from the sanctuary, and he had the authority to whip and hand over to the authorities a slave violator or, with the demarch, to fine and report a free man who violated the regulations.[15]

For the activities of one priestess we may return to Timocrite, priestess of Aglauros,[16] who in 250/49 was praised for sacrificing the εἰσιτητήρια (here, probably, of the ephebes) to Aglauros, Ares, Helios, the Horai, Apollo, and the other gods "to whom it was πάτριον." She reported, or, more precisely, her husband reported to the Boule τὰ ἀγαθά that happened in these sacrifices for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos of Athenians and of their children and wives and on behalf of King Antigonus and his Queen Phila and their descendants. She also supervised the εὐταξία in the *pannychis* and adorned a table.

Other priests and priestesses, of course, sacrificed regularly, sometimes alone, sometimes with other officials.[17] Some made reports, but only occasionally, to the Boule on their sacrifices "for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos."[18] No doubt most priests supervised their sanctuaries, and a priest of Apollo, of Amphiaraus, the priestess of Nymphe, a priestess of the Mother of the Gods, and a priest of a similar private cult are explicitly said to have done so.[19] A priestess of the same *koinon* opened the sanctuary on the appropriate days.[20] Repair of sanctuaries and their buildings was a persistent concern, and the priestess of the Thesmophoroi at Melite and the priest of Apollo Zoster in Halai Aixonides attended to this.[21] The priest of Amphiaraus in

14 εὐκοσμία, Schwenk #54.15–19; restoration of dedications, Aleshire, #IX; allotment of jurors, *IG* II^2 1163.8–10 of 284/3; *prothymata, IG* II^2 47.23–31 and 4962 of early IV BC. On Asclepius' priest Euthydemus of Eleusis in *IG* II^2 47 and what else he may have done, see Parker, 1996.182–3.

15 *IG* II^2 1362 of the end of IV BC.

16 For the text of the decree honoring her, *SEG* 33.115, see Introduction.

17 See Chapter 3.

18 See Chapter 4.

19 *IG* I^3 138.15–17, *I. Oropos* 290.25–28, *SEG* 29.135, *IG* II^2 1316.8–9, and *IG* II^2 1273.28–32.

20 *IG* II^2 1315.14–16.

21 Thesmophoroi, *Agora* 16.277.4–6; Apollo Zoster, R&O #46.3–4.

now independent Oropus, ca. 150–100 BC, not only did this but also financed much of it.[22] The priestess of the *koinon* of the Mother of the Gods also spread a couch for both Attideia,[23] and the priestesses of both Athena Polias and Aglauros also adorned tables.[24] The Mesogeioi praised their priest of Heracles who along with many others supervised the *pompe* and sacrifice for Heracles.[25] The priest of Kalliste dedicated, at his own expense, an altar in the sanctuary, in Halai Aixonides the priest of Apollo Zoster adorned the statues, and at Eleusis the priest of Heracles was responsible for the erection in the sanctuary of a *stele* detailing financial arrangements of the cult and honors to benefactors.[26] The priest of Amphiaraus had the same responsibility for publishing a contract for construction in the sanctuary.[27] The priest of Heros Iatros recommended and was deeply engaged, along with others, in the remaking or repair of dedications in his sanctuary.[28] The priest of a *thiasos* of the Mother of the gods was responsible for the crown and proclamation in honor of a member of the *thiasos*,[29] and the priests of the deme Hagnous could lend their sanctuaries' money to individuals on security of land, a house, or a tenement house.[30] *IG* I^3 52.11–13 (= M&L #58) of 434/3 looks to priests and hieropoioi for written financial records of the cults they serve. In some, relatively few, of these activities the priest or priestess might spend his or her own money.[31] In all of this one should remember that the duties of priests and priestesses varied significantly from cult to cult.

22 *I. Oropos* 294.

23 *IG* II^2 1315.9–10.

24 Aglauros, *SEG* 33.115.2 of 250/49; Athena Polias, *IG* II^2 776.10–12 of 237/6. In IV BC the hierophant twice supervised a group of men, "to spread the couch for Plouton and to adorn the table according to the oracle of the god" (*IG* II^2 1933. Cf. *IG* II^2 1934).

25 *IG* II^2 1247.17–25 of mid-III BC.

26 Kalliste, *IG* II^2 788.12–13 of 235/4 (?); Apollo Zoster, R&O #46.4–5 of ca. 360; Heracles, *I. Eleusis* 85.47–49 of 332/1.

27 *I. Oropos* 290.13–16.

28 *IG* II^3 1154 of 220/19 and II^2 840 of the end of II BC.

29 *IG* II^2 1273.13–26 of the first half of III BC.

30 R&O #63.27–32 of the third quarter of IV BC. On this process, see R&O #63 and Whitehead, 1986.165–9.

31 For which see Chapter 5.

Praises of Priests and Priestesses

Priests are most often honored "because of their εὐσέβεια towards the gods and their φιλοτιμία towards the Boule and Demos (of Athenians)."[32] *IG* II^2 1199.22–8 of 320/19 and *SEG* 18.22.18–20 of 165/4 offer two variants of this, omitting reference to the Boule and Demos and leaving the impression, perhaps wrong, that both the εὐσέβεια and φιλοτιμία of the priest were directed only to the gods. For private groups, whether the Eleusinians or a *koinon*, the φιλοτιμία was naturally directed "to themselves."[33] The order is always εὐσέβεια first, then φιλοτιμία, except in *IG* II^3 416.20–1 of 340–30 where they are reversed. Two priestesses of polis cult, of Aglauros and Athena Polias, were both honored for just their εὐσέβεια towards the god(s), with no mention of φιλοτιμία. It may or may not be relevant that in both cases male relatives are involved, the son the of the priestess of Aglauros and the husband of the priestess of Athena Polias, and the latter is expressly praised "because of his εὐσέβεια towards the gods and his φιλοτιμία towards the Boule and Demos."[34] In the fourth and early third centuries priests and priestesses were occasionally praised for their δικαιοσύνη, and in each case something the individual had done points to the reason. The priest of Amphiaraus ca. 369/8 had managed, at the least, money for a sacrifice and the erection of the *stele*.[35] The priest of Asclepius in 284/3 had sacrificed and also superintended the allotment of jurors δικαίως καὶ κατὰ το[ὺ]ς νόμους, and so is honored for his εὐσέβεια, δικαιοσύνη, καὶ φιλοτιμία, in that order.[36] About 360 the priest of Apollo Zoster is praised by demesmen for his εὐσέβεια καὶ δικαιοσύνη after he gave an accounting of his service to the demesmen. He is praised elsewhere in the text for his φιλοτιμία in restoring the sanctuary.[37] A priest of Asclepius in 328/7 is to be honored for his ἀρετὴ and δικαιοσύνη after he gives his audit. Both terms are unusual in these texts and here may refer both to his giving an audit and

32 Lambert, 2012.99–100, #6.24–26 of 272/1 (?), *IG* II^2 690.7–9 of 305/4 to ca. 270, *SEG* 18.19.22–4 of 244/3, *IG* II^2 788.24–5 of 235/4 (?), and *IG* II^3 1386 of ca. 170. *IG* II^3 1189 of ca. 215 abbreviates to

εὐσεβείας ἕ[νεκ]α [τ]ῆς
πρὸ[ς τοὺς θ]εοὺς καὶ φιλοτιμίας.

33 Eleusis, *I. Eleusis* 236.6–7 of ca. 140. Cf. *I. Eleusis* 72.20–2 and 26–9. *Koinon* of the Mother of the Gods, *IG* II^2 1314.15–17 of 213/2 and 1315.21–3 of 210/9.

34 Aglauros, *SEG* 33.115 of 250/49; Athena Polias, *IG* II^2 776.25–30 of 237/6. For more on this, see The Social Dimension, Chapter 13.

35 *I. Oropos* 290.13–20.

36 *IG* II^2 1163.

37 R&O #46.3–4, 8–9.

to his supervision of εὐκοσμία in the theater. His εὐσέβεια, separately mentioned, concerned his supervision of the sanctuary.[38] The priestess of the *koinon* of the Mother of the Gods in Piraeus in 272/1 was praised in the same terms, and she had reported dedications and had rendered revenues, both δικαίως. There is no mention of her εὐσέβεια, probably because sacrifices are nowhere described.[39]

For their priestly activities both the priestess of Athena Polias in 237/6 and the priest of Asclepius in 244/3 were commended for "making of most importance their εὐσέβεια towards the gods."[40] The formula καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, in that order, is also used to commend priestly service as a whole. The priestess of the Mother of the Gods in 212/1 performed her priestly service (ἱερωσύνη) κ[α]λῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς.[41] The priest of Apollo Zoster does his service not only καλῶς καὶ ε[ὐ]σεβῶς but also ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ.[42] In *SEG* 18.22.12–13 of 165/4 it is the behavior of the priest of Asclepius that is praised: "And he has made also his behavior (ἀναστροφή) εὐσχήμων and befitting his priestly service."[43] In 106/5 Chrysis, the priestess of Athena, was praised by the Delphians for her role in the Pythaïs to Delphi. She was "present in a grand fashion (μεγαλομερῶς) and worthily of the god and of her own virtue," and "she made her stay and behavior καλή and εὐσχήμων and worthy of the Demos of Athenians."[44] It is in these general praises of priests and priestesses that we first encounter the emphasis on esthetics (καλῶς and εὐσχήμων) that is so common for sacrificial and other religious practices.

In short, priests should demonstrate εὐσέβεια towards the gods, φιλοτιμία towards fellow citizens or cult members, should make their service εὐσχήμων, and, if financial or legal matters were involved, should show δικαιοσύνη. And a priestess should show all of the above, except φιλοτιμία. And he or she should do all of this καλῶς.

---

38 *IG* II^3 359.13–19 and 22–3.

39 *IG* II^2 1316.10–13 and 16–17.

40 *IG* II^2 776. 21–2 and *SEG* 18.19.16–18.

41 *IG* II^2 1314.5–6. Cf. *IG* II^2 1315.12–14 of 210/9.

42 R&O #46.2–3 of ca. 360. Oddly, the thiasotai of Zeus Labraundos in 299/8 attribute to their tamias a ἱερωσύνη which he performed (ἱερώσατο, also unusual) ἀξίως . . .τοῦ θεοῦ (*IG* II^2 1271.13–14).

43 πεποίηται δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀναστροφὴν εὐσχήμο[ν]α καὶ ἁρμόττουσαν τεῖ ἱερω[σ]ύνε[ι]. For a translation and discussion of this whole text, see Mikalson, 1998.265–7. The priest of the Theoi Megaloi behaved φιλοδόξως in 111/0 (*Agora* 16.325.8–9).

44 *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #3.2–10. For statues of Chrysis on the Acropolis, see *IG* II^2 3484 and 3485. On these texts and on the unique honors to this priestess, see Deshours, 2011.100–4.

CHAPTER 3

Who Sacrifices and to Whom?

> Which sacrifices were performed by magistrates, which by priests, which by both together, what functions were discharged by the many boards variously concerned with sacred affairs, some on the ritual side, some on the administrative, some on the financial: we will not enter this spider's web of detailed questions.

So Robert Parker concludes a very important discussion of who, priests or magistrates or both, could represent the polis to the gods (2005.98–9). In this chapter we do enter this spider's web, and we find that our epigraphical texts support but also refine some of the conclusions that Parker draws from his study. In particular we can isolate which priests in our period could represent the polis and which magistrates and boards did, in more general terms, sacrifice and how often. We can also define more precisely which deities and rituals were involved and what groups the sacrificers formed. It will turn out that, despite the very large number of priests, priestesses, cults, deities, and rituals in Athens, only a very few are, in our texts, explicitly linked to the interests of the polis as a whole. The vast majority of sacrifices in Athens and Attica did not involve governmental officials or any reports to the Demos or Boule.

Parker comes to the conclusion that both priests and magistrates could, independently, sacrifice in the interests of the whole polis. "There was no special mode of communication with the divine only operable by priest (or by magistrate): either could perform the same central acts with the same results, though tradition may have insisted that one or the other should do so in a particular case" (97).[1] When we apply the facts of our texts to this general principle, we will find that the general principle is valid, but in its application a surprisingly small number of priests, priestesses, and deities appear.

Priests and Priestesses

We begin with priests and priestesses sacrificing by themselves explicitly on behalf of constituent elements of the polis and reporting on their sacrifices

1 Parker's account is thorough and convincing, and here I will build on that and not rehearse all the evidence and arguments supporting it.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_005

to the polis.[2] The only priest who did both regularly was the priest of the Asclepius of the City Asclepieion. He sacrificed, alone, "on behalf of the Boule and Demos" and other relevant parties and then reported to the Boule concerning the results of these sacrifices in 328/7, 244/3, 165/4, and 137/6.[3] All other attestations of solo sacrifices and reports to the polis are single, isolated events: the priest of Zeus Soter of the Stoa of Zeus, the priestess of Athena Polias, and the priestess of Aglauros.[4] Noteworthy is the prominence of the priest of Asclepius here. Only he and perhaps the priest of Zeus Soter regularly made such sacrifices and reports. Also noteworthy is that all the deities, Asclepius, Zeus Soter, Athena Polias, and Aglauros were central to polis cult. The above priests and priestesses seemingly followed a formal procedure in making reports,[5] but the priest of Kalliste, the one relatively minor figure among this group, made several sacrifices "on behalf of the Boule and Demos," but apparently no formal report.[6] And so, if we ask with Parker whether priests individually could represent the polis before the gods, if they could, in our terms, sacrifice for "the health and safety of the Boule and Ekklesia," the answer is yes. But very few did, and only those of gods central to the polis cult, and, importantly, they almost all then reported the results of their sacrifices to the polis. To argue *ex silentio*, the vast majority of priests and priestess were not sacrificing "for the health and safety of the Boule and Ekklesia,"[7] and they were not obliged or did not feel obliged to report on their sacrifices to the polis.

Priests are on rare occasions described as making sacrifices along with other officials. A few times they made sacrifices, not surprisingly, with the hieropoioi and epimeletai of their cult.[8] Of more relevance to priestly and governmental interaction are their few sacrifices in collaboration with lay officials. The

2 On these sacrifices "on behalf of others," by priests, other religious officials, prytaneis, government officials, in religious associations, and in families, see Naiden, 2013.185–201.

3 *IG* II^3 359.10–12, 32–44, *SEG* 18.19.5–16, 34–8, *SEG* 18.22.5–10, and 18.26.13–16. Cf. *IG* II^2 1163 and *SEG* 18.27.

4 Zeus Soter, Lambert, 2012.99–100, #6.20–2 of 272/1 (?); Athena Polias, *IG* II^2 776.4–10 of 237/6; Aglauros, *SEG* 33.115.9–25 of 250/49. *Agora* 16.214 in a restoration also has sacrifices reported by the priest of Zeus Soter.

5 See Chapter 4.

6 *IG* II^2 788.8–12. A tribe (*IG* II^2 1163 of 284/3) or demes (R&O #46, *Agora* 16.277) might honor a priest or priestess for sacrifices, but apparently no report on the outcome of the sacrifices was expected.

7 This, in contrast to my conclusion in 1998.111, that "virtually all sacrifices in state cult were expressly for this purpose," i.e., for "health and safety."

8 Hieropoioi, to Dionysus, *IG* II^3 416.8–16; and epimeletai, to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, *Agora* 16.186.11–15.

priest of Demos and the Charites regularly sacrificed at the ἐγγραφαί of the ephebes, along with the ephebes, their kosmetes, and the exegetai.[9] And in the reorganization of the Apollo cults in 129/8, the priest of Apollo was to sacrifice with the basileus, the thesmothetai, and the herald of the Areopagus Council.[10] The list is brief and suggests little interaction in sacrifice among priests and governmental officials.

We now turn to which non-priestly officials in their official role performed sacrifices and to whom. We begin with administrative officials, then legislative officials, then military officials, then the elected or alloted lay officials, then the ephebes and their officials.

Administrative Officials

Archons (*as a group*)

The nine archons sacrificed at the end of their term of office "on behalf of the one who is going to be archon" (Lysias 26.6–8).[11]

Archon (*Eponymous*)

The *Athenaion Politeia* (56.4) describes at some length the archon's duties of supervision of various *heortai*, especially many aspects of the *pompe* and *agones* of the City Dionysia and the Thargelia.[12] He supervised also the *pompai* of the Asclepieia and for Zeus Soter. He appointed the choregoi and the archetheoros for the *theoria* to Delos. In all of this, the author mentions no sacrifices. In inscriptions the archons of 283/2 (Euthius) and of 282/1 (Nicias) are both praised for their supervision of the *pompe* of the City Dionysia. Euthius, in addition, "sacrificed the sacrifices to the gods κατὰ τὰ πάτρια," and Nicias reported on the sacrifices he sacrificed to Dionysus "for the health and safety of the Boule, the Demos of Athenians, and the crops in the land." He sacrificed also the "other sacrifices which it was appropriate for him to sacrifice (ὅσας αὐτῶι προσῆκεν) καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς."[13] From these two texts we

9 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.6–8 of 122/1, 1011.5–7 of 106/5, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.5–8 of 101/0, and *IG* II^2 1029.4–6 of 94/3.

10 *SEG* 21.469C.51–2.

11 The chronology and language of the passage indicate that they were sacrifices made by the prior archons at the end of their term on behalf of their successor(s)—unusual but not inconceivable.

12 Cf. Pollux 8.89.

13 *Agora* 16.181.10–13 and *IG* II^2 668.3–15. Cf. the restorations of *IG* II^2 781 and *IG* II^3 1298.

learn most about the sacrifices by the archon, that he sacrificed to Dionysus at the City Dionysia and made other, separate, traditional sacrifices to unspecified deities. It is no doubt the archon's long association with the Thargelia that led to him being ordered, in the reorganization of Apollo's *heortai* in 129/8, to sacrifice, along with the basileus and the strategoi, to Apollo and to "produce" (ἐ[πιτελ]έσαι) the *pompai* and sacrifices at the Thargelia.[14] He at least once attended, along with the strategos and the epimeletai, the ephebes' sacrifice to Ajax on Salamis,[15] and, with the other eight archons and others, received a portion of the meat at a sacrifice to Asclepius.[16]

Basileus

The *Athenaion Politeia* (57.1) assigns to the basileus supervision of the Mysteries with the epimeletai of the Mysteries,[17] administration of the Lenaia with its *pompe* and *agon*, the performance of all *agones* of the torch-races, and administration (διοικεῖ) of, "so to speak," τὰς πατρίους θυσίας . . . πάσας.[18] Plato in the *Politicus* (290e3–8) has the stranger claim that in Athens "the most revered (τὰ σεμνότατα) and especially ancestral (πάτρια) of the ancient sacrifices have been given (ἀποδεδόσθαι) to the basileus," and this probably refers to the "administration" of them rather than to their performance. In [Lysias] 6.4 it is expected that the basileus will sacrifice κατὰ τὰ πάτρια in the City Eleusinion and in the sanctuary at Eleusis. The only record of his sacrifices in epigraphical texts is in association with the refurbishing of the Apollo cult in 129/8. There he is to sacrifice to Apollo Patroös and at the Thargelia with the archon and strategoi, and again to Apollo with the priest, the herald of the Areopagus Council, and the thesmothetai.[19] His role seems to be more the administration of αἱ πάτριοι θυσίαι than actually making them,[20] and in this regard it is appropriate that the inscriptions recording the revision of the State Calendar of sacrifices at the

14 *SEG* 21.469C.24–7.

15 *IG* II^2 1008.76–7. The restoration of "nine archons" in the State Calendar (*SEG* 52.48. F9.B.2.8) is too uncertain in text and content to allow the conclusion that this attests a sacrifice by them. See Lambert, 2002.389.

16 *IG* II^2 47.32–7 of mid-IV BC.

17 Cf. *I. Eleusis* 138 of mid-IV BC. In *I. Eleusis* 100 of late IV BC the paredros of the basileus is praised for his supervision of matters concerning the Mysteries in association with the basileus and the *genos* of the Kerykes. On the religious roles of the basileus, see Rhodes, 1993.636–40 and Carlier, 1984.329–42. In the Mysteries, 330–1.

18 Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 3.1285b16–17, Pl. *Pol.* 290e5–8, Pollux 8.90, and schol. to Pl. *Phdr.* 235d and *Euthyphro* 2a. On αἱ πάτριοι θυσίαι see p. 110.

19 *SEG* 21.469C.24–6 and 51–2.

20 Carlier, 1984.330: "Le roi ne serait ainsi qu' un administrateur des cultes anciens."

end of V BC were set up in the Stoa Basileios where, as Shear (2011.254) notes, its "very intimate relationship with the basileus would have been immediately displayed."

Polemarch

According to the *Athenaion Politeia* (58.1–4), the polemarch sacrificed to Artemis Agrotera and Enyalios, arranged (διατίθημι) the ἀγὼν ἐπιτάφιος for the war-dead, and made (ποιεῖ) the ἐναγίσματα for Harmodius and Aristogiton.[21] There is no record of his sacrifices in the epigraphical record.

Thesmothetai

The *Athenaion Politeia* gives no religious activities to the thesmothetai, and in the epigraphical record they are recorded as sacrificing only once, with the basileus, the herald of the Areopagus Council, and the priest, to Apollo in the refurbishing of the Apollo cult in 129/8.[22]

Other Administrative Officials

The same text orders the tamiai of the sitiotic fund to sacrifice, along with the tamias of the Boule, to Apollo (lines 58–9) and the tamias of the stratiotic fund also to sacrifice to Apollo (56–7). In this text also, as we have seen, the herald of the Areopagus Council sacrifices to Apollo, with the basileus, the thesmothetai, and the priest (51–2). The restoration of *SEG* 16.65.11–16 of 272/1 would make it appear that the astynomoi supervised the *pompe* and sacrifice to Asclepius as well as the adornment of the table and the *pannychis*. They were also responsible for many preparations for the *heorte* of Aphrodite Pandemos, but there is no indication that they sacrificed on that occasion.[23]

The Demarch

The demarch, the chief administrative officer of each of the 139 demes, had a major role in the sacrificial program of his deme.[24] The sacred calendar of the Marathonian tetrapolis has one section specifically for sacrifices by the demarch of Marathon: to two pairs of nameless heroes and heroines

---

21 On these activities of the polemarch, see Rhodes, 1993.650–2.

22 *SEG* 21.469C.51–2.

23 *IG* II^2 659 of 283/2. On this cult and text, see Frost, 2002, Mikalson, 1998. 107–8, and Pirenne-Delforge, 1994.29–32. It appears that once the astynomoi also had some responsibilities for the *pompe* of Zeus Soter and Dionysus in Piraeus (*IG* II^2 380.17–23 of 320/19).

24 On all aspects of the office of the demarch, including sacrificial and other religious activities, see Georgoudi, 2007 and Whitehead, 1986, esp. 127–8 and 134–7.

identified by locations, to Achaia, to the Moirai, to Hyttenios, to Kourotrophos, to the Tritopatores, and to the Acamantes.[25] In the sacred calendar of Erchia the demarch receives "gifts of honor" or "perquisites" (γέρα) at a sacrifice to Hermes, and the wording of the passage leaves open the possibility that he received γέρα at most or many of the deme's numerous sacrifices. So, too, the demarch of Skambonidai sacrificed at least twice and probably several times more each year. In 165/4 the demarch of Eleusis is honored for having sacrificed at the Haloa and Chloia to Demeter and Kore; having sacrificed to Dionysus, sent the *pompe*, and "made" the *agon* at the Dionysia;[26] and having participated in (συνετέλεσεν) the sacrifice and having sent the *pompe* of the Kalamaia. The same official, ca. 300 BC, sacrificed to Dionysus "for the health and safety of the demesmen." In 350–325 the demarch of Hagnous sacrificed the Plerosia to Zeus and distributed the meat. About 303 the demarch of Ikarion "sacrificed to all the gods "to whom [πάτριον ἦν] to sacrifice, and the demarch of the same deme in the mid-fourth century also "made" the *heorte* for Dionysus καλῶς καὶ δικαίως. In 263/2 the demarch of Rhamnous sacrificed "to all the gods and heroes."[27] In *SEG* 43.26.A1–7 and B1–7 of 315/4 the tamias of the deme Acharnai is praised for "having sacrificed to the gods and heroes on behalf of the demesmen" and for having supervised, with the demarch and the epimeletai of the Dionysia, the sacrifice, *pompe*, and *agon* for Dionysus. The same two officials, the demarch and the tamias of Rhamnous, were, before 236/5, to supervise new annual deme sacrifices to Antigonus Gonatas at the Nemesia (*SEG* 41.75).[28]

Despite these numerous attestations of sacrifices by demarchs, *SEG* 54.224 should warn us against overestimating this activity in the demes. There ten sacrifices of the deme Aixone are recorded, and all are performed by priests or priestesses, none by the demarch.[29]

---

25 *SEG* 50.168.A2.23–33 of 375–350 (?). On all aspects of this text, see Lambert, 2000a.

26 This would have been at the Dionysia in Eleusis, just as, below, the Dionysia are those at Ikarion and Acharnai.

27 Erchia, *SEG* 21.541.E47–58 of 375–350 (?); Skambonidai, *IG* I^3 244 of ca. 460; Eleusis, *I. Eleusis* 229.6–17, 30–7 (On which text see Deshours, 2011.147–9) and 101.8–10; Hagnous, R&O #63.33–5; Ikarion, *IG* II^2 1178 and *SEG* 22.117.1–2 (For other activities of this demarch in the Ikarian Dionysia, see also *IG* I^3 253 and 254); and Rhamnous, *I. Rhamnous* II.6.8–11. A sacrifice is probable also for the demarch of Kollytos in *SEG* 44.42.25–7 of, perhaps, 323/2.

28 On this text, see Mikalson, 1998.160. In *SEG* 49.141 of 290/89 (?) the tamias and hieropoioi of Halai Aixonides are honored for their sacrifices.

29 On this see Parker, 2010.197.

Legislative Officials

> I know that all the prytaneis sacrifice together on each occasion and dine with one another and pour libations together. . . . The Boule does these same things: it sacrifices εἰσιτητήρια, it feasts together, and it shares in libations and sacrifices. So, too, the strategoi, and, so to speak, all the offices (αἱ ἀρχαί).
>
> DEMOSTHENES, 19.190

Ekklesia

There are in the epigraphical texts no sacrifices nor, in fact, any religious actions attributed to the Ekklesia as a body. An act of the Ekklesia would be termed an act of the Demos.

Boule

Demosthenes (21.114) claims that, as a member of the Boule, he "served as hieropoios for the εἰσιτητήρια on behalf of the Boule" and he sacrificed, and he "began the sacrifices / rituals" (κατάρξασθαι τῶν ἱερῶν) on behalf "of the whole polis."[30] What had Demosthenes done? Although the evidence is not clear, I think that during his prytany he made the opening sacrifices for each meeting of the Boule (the *eisiteteria* in this context).[31] As a member of the Boule the defendant of Antiphon 6.45 prayed, with other members of the Boule, to Zeus Boulaios and Athena Boulaia as they entered the Bouleuterion. These would be prayers accompanying the *eisiteteria* that Demosthenes describes. The defendant also claims that as he entered "the other sanctuaries" with the Boule, he sacrificed and prayed "on behalf of the democracy." These probably routine sacrifices of the Boule are not attested in the epigraphical documents.

I. Eleusis 142 of 353/2, in part by restorations, leaves the impression that the Boule, in addition to supervising that the ἀπαρχαί of grain to Eleusis occur, is by the new *nomos* to supervise (ἐπιμελεῖσθαι) that the sacrifices be sacrificed on behalf of the Demos, both those "from the *pelanos*"[32] as directed by the Eumolpidae and also the sacrifices to Zeus, Demeter, Kore, Triptolemus, Euboulos, "the god and goddess," and Athena. The Boule, when the ἀπαρχή is

---

30 Cf. Dem. 19.190, above.

31 For the latter, see Prytaneis below. For the view that these *eisiteteria* were sacrifices made only at the beginning of the year by the Boule, see MacDowell, 1990.338 and Rhodes, 1972.132.

32 On the *pelanos* and the meaning of this phrase, see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.48.

gathered and sent to Eleusis, is to sacrifice all the sacrifices [κατὰ] τὸν νόμον.[33] And, at the deme level, in 331/0 or 330/29 the four bouleutai of the deme Teithras were honored by the members of that deme for having supervised the sacrifices and other things which the demesmen ordered.[34]

In their treaty with Chalkis after the revolt of Euboea, in 446/5 the Boule is to select three of their members to "sacrifice the sacrificial victims," the ones "from the oracles concerning Euboea," with the strategoi supervising them and providing the money, almost certainly not from their personal funds (*IG* I^3 40.64–69 = M&L #52).

The tamias of the Boule had some religious duties. When Nicocrates served as that tamias, he "dispensed funds to the hieropoioi for victims for sacrifices and 'himself joined (the hieropoioi) in supervision,' sacrificing all the sacrifices." In this office he also spent some of his own money for sacrifices.[35] In the reorganization of the Apollo cult in 129/8 the tamias of the Boule also, with the tamiai of the grain fund, sacrificed to Apollo (*SEG* 21.469C.58–9).[36]

Prytaneis

Demosthenes (19.190) claims that all the prytaneis sacrifice, dine, and pour libations together. The phrasing of the passage (above) suggests that some of these sacrifices were εἰσιτητήρια. The numerous decrees honoring prytaneis confirm Demosthenes' statements. Clearly every prytany in its turn sacrificed to Apollo Prostaterios before meetings of the Ekklesia. Apollo Prostaterios was joined by Artemis Boulaia by 259/8,[37] and later by Artemis Phosphoros, first attested in 182/1, omitted in 181/0 and 178/7, but from 175/4 on usually present.[38] Occasional sacrifices by prytanies are also attested for a number of deities:

---

33 On this text, see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.133–5. *IG* II^3 306.21–2 is restored in *Agora* 15.34 to have the members of the Boule honored in 343/2 with a dedication to Hephaestus and Athena Hephaistia for, among other things, having sacrificed "for the health and safety of the Boule and the Demos of Athenians."

34 *Agora* 15.45.

35 *Agora* 15.85.12–15 of mid-III BC.

36 The problematic Themistocles Decree would have the Boule and strategoi sacrificing an ἀρεστήριον to Zeus Pankrates, Athena, Nike, and Poseidon Asphaleios (M&L #23.37–40) as, apparently, part of manning the fleet to meet the Persian invasion in 480. There are a number of problems with this. Why an ἀρεστήριον, and why, uncommonly, to four separate deities? Zeus Pankrates is not otherwise known as a polis deity in this period, nor is an independent Nike. On this see Habicht, 1961.6–7.

37 *Agora* 15.89.8.

38 On Artemis Boulaia, Artemis Phosphoros, and their appearances on prytany decrees, see Mikalson, 1998.194–5 and 295.

to Apollo Patroös, Athena Archegetis at the Chalkeia, Demeter and Kore at the Stenia, the Mother of the Gods, Theseus, Zeus at the Kronia, Zeus Ktesios, and the Soteres, probably as Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira.[39] *Agora* 16.114 of 304/3 is valuable in recording the institution of new sacrifices, to commemorate the success and victory of Athenians campaigning with Demetrius Poliorcetes. The prytaneis are to sacrifice to Athena Nike, Agathe Tyche, and the Soteres (here, surely, Demetrius and his father), and hereafter during each Elaphebolion they are to sacrifice to Agathe Tyche and the Soteres.[40] In the reorganization of the Apollo *heortai* in 129/8 the prytaneis in service at the time are henceforth to sacrifice the "sixth-month offering" (ἑξαμηνιαῖον), surely to Apollo, and this involved both a sacrifice and a *pompe*.[41] Prytaneis in 140/39 also dedicated the special wreath, the εἰρυσιώνη, to Apollo.[42]

Two prytany decrees do much to explain these occasional sacrifices. The prytaneis of the tribe Antiochis were honored in 140/39, on the eighteenth day of the fifth prytany, eighteen days after they had finished their term of service (*Agora* 15.240). During their term they had sacrificed to Demeter and Kore at the Stenia and to Theseus. Each of these sacrifices occurred once a year, in the month Pyanopsion,[43] i.e., during the fourth prytany in this period of twelve tribes. So, too, the prytaneis of the fourth prytany in 273/2 are honored, but during their term of service, and provisions are made on Pyanopsion 29 for their upcoming sacrifice to Athena Archegetis at the Chalkeia which, we know, was celebrated on Pyanopsion 30 (*Agora* 15.78).[44] These prytaneis must have been sacrificing to deities whose annual sacrifices occurred during their prytany.[45] Here we have one major form of polis representation at certain cults, a sacrifice by the current prytaneis. We need not assume that the

39 Apollo Patroös, *Agora* 15.240.11 of 140/39 (restored) and 260.4–5 of early I BC; Athena Archegetis, *Agora* 15.70.7 of ca. 290–75, 78.16 of 273/2, and 15.183.8 (restored) of 182/1; Demeter and Kore, *Agora* 15.70.7 of ca. 290–75 (restored), 78.7 of 273/2, and 240.9–10 of 140/39; Mother of the Gods, *Agora* 15.180.10 of 195/4 (?); Theseus, *Agora* 15.240.11 of 140/39 and *IG* II^2 957.10 of 157/6; Zeus at Kronia, *Agora* 15.81.6 of 267/6 (restored); Zeus Ktesios, *IG* II^3 1304.9 of 180/79 (?); and Soteres, *Agora* 15.115.12–13 of 234/3. On the last, see Mikalson, 1998.111–12.

40 On this and related texts, see Mikalson, 1998.84–5.

41 *SEG* 21.469C.59–61.

42 *Agora* 15.240.11–12.

43 The Stenia on Pyanopsion 9, the Theseia on Pyanopsion 8. See Mikalson, 1975.70–1.

44 On the date of the Chalkeia, see Mikalson, 1975.78.

45 If the restoration in *Agora* 15.240.11–12 is correct, we may assume that a *heorte* or sacrifice for Apollo Patröos and the dedication of the εἰρυσιώνη to Apollo occurred during Pyanopsion.

prytaneis' sacrifice was the major one at these *heortai*, but it did show special polis concern for them. Other occasional sacrifices by prytaneis reveal polis participation in the same form in the *heortai* of other deities, including the Mother of the Gods,[46] Zeus at the Kronia (of Hekatombaion 12), Zeus Ktesios, Asclepius in Piraeus, and perhaps Zeus and Athena as the Soteres in late Skirophorion.[47]

There were 50 prytaneis in each prytany, and we may ask who among them actually performed the sacrifices expected of the prytany. The decrees honoring tamiai of the prytanies, each elected by his fellow prytaneis, indicate that he "sacrificed all the sacrifices which were appropriate for him (καθῆκον) in the prytany, on behalf of his fellow tribesmen, the Boule, and the Demos."[48] Sometimes the grammateus of the prytany joined him,[49] and once we have the tamias and grammateus of the prytany and the tamias of the Boule.[50] The individual always present, however, is the tamias of the prytany, and it is most likely that the sacrifices he made were those before meetings of the Ekklesia to Apollo Prostaterios and Artemis Boulaia. These individuals were honored and crowned by the polis usually for sacrificing καλῶς and φιλοτίμως. They offer a nice context for Theophrastus' "Man of Petty Ambition" (μικροφιλότιμος) (*Char*. 21). μικροφιλοτιμία may be defined as "a feeling of honor based on trivialities."[51] This individual contrived to become the one who, as a prytanis, made the report on the prytany's sacrifice to the Mother of the Gods at the Galaxia. For this "small" (μικρ-) service he basked, at home, in his φιλοτιμία.[52]

---

46 Since a prytany could be honored before the end of its service, *Agora* 15.180.10 may indicate that the *heorte* or sacrifice for the Mother of the Gods occurred sometime in the period Hekatombaion 1–20.

47 Zeus at Kronia, *Agora* 15.81.6; Zeus Ktesios, *IG* II^3 1304.9; Asclepius, *IG* II^2 47.35–8; and the Soteres, *Agora* 15.115.12–13.

48 *Agora* 15.38.74–6 of 341/0, 85.1–4 and 86.9–13, both of mid-III BC, and *IG* II^3 1144.22–3 of just before 224 and 1231.39–44 of 210–201.

49 *IG* II^3 1168.44–7 of 211/0 and 1153.47–50 of 222/1. In *Agora* 15.85 the εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα of line 6 suggests that there, too, the grammateus joined the tamias in the sacrifices.

50 *Agora* 15.89.23–9 of 259/8. It would appear from *Agora* 15.85 that Nicocrates fulfilled his sacrificial functions as tamias of the prytany, but was also elected tamias of the Boule, and in that role "dispensed funds to the hieropoioi for victims for sacrifices and 'himself joined (the hieropoioi) in supervision,' sacrificing all the sacrifices" (12–15).

51 On this see Diggle, 2004.405 and 413–18.

52 A nice parallel here is Plato, *Rep*. 5.475a9–b2, of the φιλότιμοι who, if they can't be strategoi, are content with being trittyarchs, and if they can't receive τιμή from the greater and more revered are content to receive it from the smaller and meaner people, because they are τιμῆς ἐπιθυμηταί.

The defendant of Antiphon 6.45, in describing his work on a prytany, speaks of his "serving as a hieropoios and sacrificing on behalf of the democracy," and he may have presided over one of the prytany's occasional sacrifices, as did Theophrastus' Man of Petty Ambition.

Military Officers

Strategoi

Dem. 19.190, above, would suggest a rather extensive sacrificial program of the strategoi, but this is not supported by epigraphical evidence. There only rarely are the strategoi, as a group, presented as participating in a sacrifice.[53] In 275/4 and 271/0 the strategoi sacrificed what look to be regular sacrifices with the taxiarchs.[54] In 129/8, in the reorganization of the cult of Apollo, the strategoi, along with the basileus and the archon, are to sacrifice the apparently new sacrifices to Apollo and the sacrifices at the Thargelia.[55] Elsewhere we have, only once, one strategos participating, with the archon and the epimeletai, in the sacrifice the ephebes made to Ajax at the Aianteia on Salamis in 118/7.[56] More regular, and more public, were the libations the strategoi as a group made to Dionysus during the City Dionysia.[57]

In *IG* II^2 1496, in the account of the dermaticon fund from 334/3 to 331/0, a number of officials including boönai, the epimeletai of the Mysteries, hieropoioi, and syllogeis received revenue from the sale of skins of sacrificed victims at various *heortai* and sacrifices.[58] The strategoi received such funds from the sacrifices to Hermes Hegemonios (84–5, 115–16), Eirene (94–5, 127–8), Ammon (96–7), at the Lenaia (105–6, 146–7), at the City Dionysia (111–12), to Demokratia (131–2, 140–1), at the Dionysia in Piraeus (144–5), and to Agathe Tyche (148–9). Noteworthy is how many of these sacrifices were relatively new, introduced in the fourth century: to Eirene, Ammon, Demokratia, and Agathe Tyche. Some

53 We do not include sacrifices by individual strategoi on the battlefield, as, e.g., by Themistocles (Plut. *Them*. 13), Nicias (*Nic*. 24), and Phocion (*Phoc*. 13). The reported sacrifice of an ἀρεστήριον by the Boule and strategoi in the face of the Persian invasion (Themistocles Decree, M&L #23.37–30) is likely erroneous. See above, p. 63.

54 *Agora* 16.185.7–11 and 187.9–13.

55 *SEG* 21.469C.24–7.

56 *IG* II^2 1008.77. For unspecified but apparently traditional sacrifices by a strategos in 293/2, see *SEG* 45.101.23–7.

57 Plut. *Cim*. 8.

58 See Mikalson, 1998.36–40 for this text and for the evidence for the deities, *heortai*, and sacrifices listed there. See also Rosivach, 1994.48–67.

were, of course, long-established *heortai*, especially the various Dionysia. The management of some of these revenues in the first year of the record, 334/3, was held by others: of the City Dionysia and of the Dionysia at Piraeus by the boönai (70–1, 80–1), of the Lenaia by the epimeletai of the Mysteries (74–5), and of the sacrifice to Agathe Tyche by hieropoioi in 334/3 (76–7) and in 332/1 (107–108). But all these were handled by the strategoi in 331/0. All this suggests that after 334/3 these responsibilities were being transferred from the other officials to the strategoi.[59] We should not assume that the strategoi themselves made these sacrifices. The strategoi must simply be handling the funds that accrued from the sale of the skins of the many victims on these occasions.[60]

The officials, usually strategoi, who commanded guard troops garrisoned in forts in Attica in the third century BC form a special group, and unlike other military commanders assumed a role in the religious activities of the troops they commanded and of the demes in which they were stationed.[61] If we limit ourselves here to just the sacrifices they performed, we have in 235/4 the Rhamnousians honoring the Athenian Dicaearchus who had been put in charge of the garrison by the Macedonian king Demetrius. Dicaearchus at his own expense had contributed victims for the sacrifices of the Nemesia since these sacrifices had lapsed because of the war with Aratus.[62] One wonders if this may in part have been an attempt to win popularity with a somewhat hostile population. About 229, immediately after Athens secured her independence from the Macedonians, the soldiers twice honored their strategoi for

59 The pattern suggests that this is a better conclusion than Kahrstedt's claim (1936.290) that which official was involved was "belanglos und wird oft fallweise geregelt."

60 Kahrstedt (1936.289–90) attributes all these sacrifices to the strategoi, arguing that priests or other sacrificers usually received the skins of the victims as perquisites. (Parker, 2005.99 n. 33, is uncertain.) If the strategoi controlled the skins, Kahrstedt claims, they must have made the sacrifices. Priests did often receive the skins as their perquisite, but it seems that the very creation of the dermaticon fund was intended to return these revenues to the state, which one might see as a typically Lycurgan measure to increase state revenues. The strategoi and other officials were simply responsible as administrators to see that this was done. If they did in fact make these sacrifices, it is very surprising that they are not mentioned elsewhere in the sources for these religious activities. Why the strategoi were chosen for this task, we do not know, nor why, for example, the epimeletai of the Mysteries were at least once responsible for the revenues from the Lenaia, but on the interest of Eleusinian officials in the Lenaia, note *I. Eleusis* 177.244 and the schol. to Aristophanes' *Ran*. 479.

61 On these texts, and on these commanders and their roles in these communities including and beyond that of sacrificing, and on the specific cults, see Mikalson, 1998.155–60 and 178.

62 *I. Rhamnous* II.17.27–30. On this see Habicht, 2006.157.

their sacrifices to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira and linked those sacrifices to the recovery of "ancestral freedom."[63] In 211/0 the strategos Nicomachus sacrificed to Themis, Nemesis, and the other gods "to whom it was ancestral (πάτριον) (to sacrifice)," and to Aphrodite Hegemone, a local Rhamnousian cult figure, on leaving office.[64] The strategos Aristophanes in or shortly after 235/4 was honored by the troops stationed at Eleusis, Panakton, and Phyle for sacrificing at the Eleusinian *heorte* of the Haloa to Demeter and Kore.[65] Also at Eleusis a strategos sacrificed, with the Eleusinians, at the *heorte* of the Great Eleusinia to Demeter and Kore.[66] All of these sacrifices by these strategoi or commanders of garrisons are determined by specific, unusual circumstances and are not indicative, so far as we know, of the usual sacrificial activity of strategoi.

Taxiarchs

In 275/4 and 271/0 the taxiarchs are honored for, among other things, having sacrificed, from their own funds, "the sacrifices which it was necessary for them to sacrifice" with the strategoi.[67] Other honors to taxiarchs in other years mention no such sacrifices.[68] In 281/0 a delegation of six taxiarchs was sent to Boeotia to sacrifice at the *heorte* of the Basileia and reported on the results of their sacrifice.[69]

Hipparchs

Xenophon opens his essay on the hipparch with the recommendation that this official "sacrifice and ask the gods to grant that he think, say, and do those things from which he would hold office in a way most pleasing to the gods and most dear, glorious, and beneficial to himself, his friends, and the city"

---

63 *I. Rhamnous* II.26.6–8 and 22.1–4. On this cult see Mikalson, 1998.158.

64 *I. Rhamnous* II.32.10–14. For her cult at Rhamnous, see Mikalson, 1998.157–8. For other, unspecified sacrifices by commanders at Rhamnous, see *I. Rhamnous* II.23.1–3, 38.11–12, 49.20–1, and 50.22–3.

65 *I. Eleusis* 196.9–11, 22–4.

66 *I. Eleusis* 211.25–8. Cf. *I. Eleusis* 194.22.

67 *Agora* 16.185.7–11 and 187.9–13.

68 E.g., *IG* II^2 685 and *SEG* 3.116.

69 *Agora* 16.182. On the historical circumstances of this *theoria*, see commentary in *Agora* 16 and Mikalson, 1998.134. In *Agora* 16.123.11–15 of 302/1 the taxiarchs are honored because ἐπεμελήθησαν τῆς εὐκοσμίας τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τῆς Δήμητρος. This is usually taken to mean they supervised good order "in the sacred rites of Demeter," but may better be "in the sanctuaries of Demeter." On the possible circumstances of this event, see commentary in *Agora* 16.

(*Hipp*. 1.1). We would hardly expect to find such a private prayer and sacrifice in epigraphical texts, but Xenophon also lists as a duty of the hipparch "that he will 'seek good omens in sacrifices' (καλλιερήσει) to the gods on behalf of the cavalry" (3.1), and such a sacrifice might well be the *eisiteteria* which two hipparchs are praised for having made to Poseidon (Hippios?) and perhaps two other deities ca. 184/3.[70] Fellow cavalrymen also praised their hipparch in 187/6 who, among many other things, had sacrificed with them "to the god."[71] These, too, may have been the *eisiteteria*.

Phylarchs

SEG 46.148 records the honors given by his fellow tribesmen to a phylarch because, among other things, he sacrificed "all the sacrifices to the gods."

Trierarchs

In 224/3 the Rhamnousians praised effusively the trierarch on whose ship they had apparently sailed. Like the strategoi at Rhamnous he sacrificed to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, and here we have the fullest account of the purpose of such sacrifices, "for the health and safety and harmony of those who sailed with him, so that they might be harmonious and protected and for the future useful to the Demos." He also sacrificed with the strategos and the hieropoioi to Nemesis at Rhamnous.[72] These particular sacrifices, like those of the strategoi at Rhamnous, should be seen as a result of the particular conditions there, not a common practice of all trierarchs.

Alloted or Elected Lay Religious Officials

Agonothetai

IG II^2 780 of 252/1 offers the fullest description of an agonothetes' sacrifices at the City Dionysia: he made sacrifices to Dionysus and the other gods to whom it was πάτριον to sacrifice, and the Ekklesia accepts his report of "the good things" (τὰ ἀγαθά) that occurred in the sacrifices he was making "for the health and safety of the Boule and the Demos of Athenians and for the children and wives and for King Antigonus." He made all the "ancestral" sacrifices at the

70 *Agora* 16.270.

71 *IG* II^3 1281. 23–4. On who this god might be, see Habicht, 1961a.135. I leave aside the hipparchs' sacrifices for omens in battle, as in Xen. *Hipp*. 6.6 and 9.8.

72 περὶ τῆς ὑγιείας καὶ σωτηρίας καὶ ὁμονοίας τῶν [συ]νπλευσάντων, ὅπως ἂν ὁμονοοῦντες καὶ σωιζόμεν[οι κ]αὶ εἰς τὸ μετὰ ταῦτα χρήσιμοι γίνωνται τῶι δήμωι. *I. Rhamnous* II.31.9–12, 16–18.

appropriate times καλῶς and εὐσεβῶ[ς] (lines 6–15).[73] In 255/4 the agonothetes sacrificed five bulls during the Dionysia.[74] Of the agonothetes of 284/3 we learn only that he sacrificed "the ancestral sacrifices to the gods" on behalf of the Demos.[75] The agonothetes of 282/1 supervised (ἐπεμελήθη) the sacrifices, "so that they all might be accomplished κατὰ τὰ πάτρια."[76] Miltiades, ca. 140, as agonothetes of the Panathenaia in his apparent restoration of that *heorte* "did in a grand manner (μεγαλομέρως) all the things for the *pompe* and the sacrifices owed to the gods," although nothing is said of him himself sacrificing.[77] Finally, agonothetai of the Theseia in the mid- to late second century BC are honored, in part because they joined in the performance (συνετέλεσεν) of the sacrifice to Theseus κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[78] For the agonothetai, therefore, we have only solo sacrifices to Dionysus and the other gods in the Dionysia, and, for the agonothetai of the Theseia, participation in the sacrifice to Theseus at that *heorte*.

Athlothetai

No sacrifices are indisputably recorded for the athlothetai.[79]

Boönai

Since the little-known boönai had some responsibility for the purchasing of oxen for sacrifice at some *heortai*, they naturally also were given responsibility for the revenues from the sale of the skins of the victims after some *heortai*,[80] but there is no indication that they themselves made sacrifices.

Choregoi

Neither choregoi of the polis nor those of demes are recorded as making sacrifices.[81] Those of the demes, however, might in the fourth century be rewarded with ten drachmas "for a sacrifice," i.e., a "thank-you sacrifice."[82]

---

73 On the *agonothesia* in the Hellenistic period, see Chapter 5.

74 *SEG* 39.125.10–13.

75 *IG* II^2 657.38–41.

76 *IG* II^2 682.53–5.

77 *IG* II^2 968.41–51. On this text, see Mikalson, 1998.258. On the agonothetai of the Panathenaia, see Shear, 2001.472–90.

78 *IG* II^2 956.2–6 of 161/0, 957.1–4 of 157/6, and 958.1–5 of 153/2. Cf. *SEG* 40.121 of 109/8.

79 *IG* II^2 784.11–13 of 239/8 has been restored to have the athlothetai make an unlikely sacrifice to Apollo Prostaterios.

80 *IG* II^3 447.42–4 and *IG* II^2 1496.70–4, 80–1, 88–9, 118–19, 133.

81 Three victorious choregoi of the deme Aigilia, however, dedicated a statue and altar to Dionysus (*IG* II^2 3096 of before mid-IV BC). On them see Whitehead, 1986.417.

82 *SEG* 34.103.12–14 of 335–315, from Halieis; Schwenk #66.13–18 of 326/5 from Aixone; *SEG* 36.186.9–11, also from Aixone. Cf. *I. Eleusis* 70.35–6 of mid-IV BC, a "virtual" *choregia*. On

Epimeletai

Epimeletai were elected or allotted to supervise certain activities of certain *heortai*. The *Athenaion Politeia* (56.22–6) describes the epimeletai of the City Dionysia which they, along with the archon, supervised.[83] So the epimeletai elected in 186/5 for the *pompe* of the City Dionysia sacrificed "to the gods to whom it was πάτριον (to sacrifice)."[84] In 272/1 epimeletai were elected just for the supervision of the sacrifice to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira in the city, and in that role they sacrificed with the priest.[85] In 163/2 the priest of Zeus Soter in Piraeus and the epimeletai reported to the Boule on sacrifices they made to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira,[86] and, in an odd combination, to Asclepius, Hygieia, and the gods of this cult. The most likely explanation is that the priest sacrificed to Zeus and Athena, and that the epimeletai were associated with Asclepius' cult in Piraeus and sacrificed to him.[87] Finally, epimeletai, along with the archon and a strategos, once participated with the ephebes in their sacrifice to Ajax on Salamis.[88] It would seem that epimeletai relatively rarely themselves sacrificed, and one indication of this may be *IG* II^3 355 of 329/8, where the extensive duties of the epimeletai of the Amphiaraia are described but there is no mention of them sacrificing nor of their εὐσέβεια which usually accompanies sacrificial activity. They are, however, to receive the customary money for a "thank-you" sacrifice.

We learn from the *Athenaion Politeia* that there were four epimeletai of the Mysteries elected by the Demos, two from all the Athenians, and one each from the Eumolpidae and the Kerykes (57.1–4).[89] *IG* II^3 1164 of 214/3 praises two of these epimeletai, probably the two elected "from all the Athenians," for a variety of activities, including because "they sacrificed all the sacrifices which were appropriate for (καθῆκον) them in their year, to Demeter, Kore, and the other gods to whom it was πάτριον to sacrifice on behalf of the Boule, Demos, children, and women" (10–16).[90] The occasions of these sacrifices were probably

---

"thank-you" sacrifices, see below, p. 244. On choregoi of the demes, see Whitehead, 1986, esp. 215–19, 234–6, and 238–9.

83 Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 7.1323a1–3.

84 *IG* II^3 1284.34–6.

85 *Agora* 16.186.11–15. In *IG* II^2 676.10–13 of 273/2 multiple sacrifices to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, probably one to each, by the epimeletai are indicated.

86 On Zeus Soter of Piraeus as separate from Zeus Soter in the city, see Mikalson, 1998.38–9 and Parker, 1996.238–41.

87 *IG* II^2 783.

88 *IG* II^2 1008.77 of 118/7.

89 On the epimeletai of the Mysteries, see also Appendix 7.

90 On this text see Deshours, 2011. 143–6 and Mikalson, 1998.182–3. Cf. *I. Eleusis* 192.9–15 of 249/8 and *IG* II^3 1188.2–5 of ca. 215.

the Mysteries at Agrai and at Eleusis. In *I. Eleusis* 181 of 267/6 two epimeletai report the sacrifice which they made at the Mysteries in Agrai "for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos and others who are well-intentioned and are friends of the Demos" (7–19). In this text the epimeletai also supervised (ἐπεμ[ελή]θησαν) the sacrifice at the Great Mysteries (19–22). In *IG* II^2 1496.74–75 the epimeletai of the Mysteries seemingly controlled the funds from the sale of the skins of victims of the sacrifices at the Lenaia in 334/3, but the next year the strategoi controlled these funds (105–6). Neither implies that these officials performed sacrifices there. The epimeletai of the Mysteries were, as so many Eleusinian officials, a special case, and other epimeletai seem rarely themselves to have sacrificed but on occasion to have participated in sacrifices performed by others.

In a private cult Bacchis, the epimeletria of a *thiasos* of Agathe Thea, sacrificed at the end of her year of service (*SEG* 56.203.11–13).

Epistatai

Of the various epistatai, only two sets are known to have made sacrifices. In the long financial record of *I. Eleusis* 177 of 329/8 the epistatai of Eleusis primarily receive and dispense funds, as epistatai usually do, but three times they apparently themselves made small sacrifices, at a cost of twenty drachmas each, at the Mysteries (41–2), at the Dionysia in Piraeus (168), and at the Lenaia (244).[91] In *IG* II^2 47.28–30 of the early fourth century epistatai of the Asclepieion in Piraeus, otherwise unknown, are to sacrifice the "presacrifices" (προθύματα) which the priest directs.

Exegetai

The only recorded sacrifices by the exegetai are the *eisiteteria* they made, with the ephebes and their kosmetes and the priest of Demos and Charites, to the Demos and Charites at the "enrollment" (ἐγγραφαί) of the ephebes at the Prytaneion.[92] They are not listed in the first surviving record of the same event in 127/6.[93]

---

91 Cf. line 251.

92 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.6–8 of 122/1 and 222–6, T30.7–12 of 116/5, *IG* II^2 1011.5–7 of 106/5, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.5–8 of 101/0, and *IG* II^2 1029.4–6 of 94/3.

93 *SEG* 15.104.5–8.

Hieropoioi

Parker (2011.49 and 55), quite properly reflecting the etymology, gives for hieropoioi "performers of sacred rites,"[94] but did they in fact "perform" sacred rites? Did they sacrifice?[95] The *Athenaion Politeia* (54.6–7) describes two boards of hieropoioi, each of ten men chosen by lot by the Demos. The one board, called the hieropoioi "for expiatory sacrifices" (ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα) makes those sacrifices ordered by an oracle (μαντευτά)[96] and if there is any other need to καλλιερεῖν ("to obtain good omens"). Both, apparently, were performed with the *manteis*.[97] The second board, the hieropoioi "for the year," "sacrifice some sacrifices" and administer all the quadrennial *heortai* except the Panathenaia, and these *heortai* apparently include the *theoria* to Delos, the Brauronia, the Herakleia, the Eleusinia,[98] the Hephaisteia, and, after 329/8, possibly the Amphiaraia.[99] There were other such boards of hieropoioi as, for example, of the Semnai (Dem. 21.115), and those we find below.

Hieropoioi, either those "for the year" or a special group just for the annual Panathenaia, in addition to other duties sacrificed to Athena Polias, Athena Nike, and Athena Hygieia.[100] In 340–330 ten hieropoioi and the priest of Dionysus in Piraeus report to the Boule τὰ ἀγαθά that occurred in the sacrifices they performed to Dionysus "and the other gods," probably in the major Dionysiac *heorte* of Piraeus. For their efforts they were each awarded gold crowns and the hieropoioi received a "thank-you" offering.[101] The hieropoioi of the Rhamnousian cult of Nemesis and Themis joined the strategos and the

94 As does Flower, 2015.296.

95 Deshours (2011.128) terms them "commissaires chargés des sacrifices."

96 Cf. Xen. *An*. 6.1.22.

97 There is no other record of sacrifices by these hieropoioi. On καλλιερεῖν, see Appendix 3.

98 On hieropoioi for Eleusinian cults, see Clinton, 1980.282.

99 It appears as though the text of the *Ath. Pol*. which lists the Hephaisteia after 329/8 has confused two *heortai*. We know, see below, that hieropoioi were involved with the Hephaisteia as early as 421/0, and that the Amphiaraia was inaugurated in 329/8. A common assumption is that here the Hephaisteia was confused with the Amphiaraia, and then the Amphiaraia was wrongly omitted. But if this is so, only the Amphiaraia would have both epimeletai and hieropoioi, perhaps the epimeletai for the annual *heorte*, the hieropoioi for a quadrennial one. See below, p. 212. On these questions see Rhodes, 1993.610.

100 *IG* II^3 447.34–6, 42–50. As the hieropoioi "for the year," Lambert, 2012a.83–4, or as just for the annual Panathenaia, Shear. 2001.104–5 and 451–5. On virtually all aspects of the Panathenaia see Shear, 2001 and on these sacrifices specifically, 75–6 and 87–91.

101 *IG* II^3 416. On this text, see Lambert, 2012a.222–3, 299–310 and Mikalson, 1998.42–44.

taxiarch in a sacrifice to Nemesis in 224/3.[102] About 500 BC the hieropoioi of the Eleusinia were to sacrifice προτέλεια to either the Eleusinia or the Mysteries (*I. Eleusis* 13).[103] And hieropoioi of the cult of Hebe at Aixone also made sacrifices to her and "the other gods."[104]

The two boards of hieropoioi created for the new or, more likely, reorganized quadrennial Hephaisteia in 421/0 were given many responsibilities including the distribution of the portions from sacrifices,[105] supervision of the *pompe*, discipline, the torch race, and such things, but nowhere is it said that they themselves were to sacrifice.[106] It was no doubt the hieropoioi "for the year" who handled the revenues from the sale of skins of victims in *IG* II^2 1496 during the years 334/3–331/0, and these included the *heortai* of the Asclepieia (78–9, 109–10),[107] Bendideia (86–7, 117), Eleusinia (130, 138–9), Panathenaia (98–9, 129), and Theseia (134–5) and the sacrifice to Agathe Tyche (76–7, 107–8). Handling of these monies does not, by itself, indicate that these hieropoioi sacrificed at these events.[108]

Hieropoioi were heavily involved in the administration of several polis *heortai*, and occasionally they sacrificed, always as a group, sometimes the group of hieropoioi alone, sometimes in association with the priests or other attending officials. But neither the noun ἱεροποιός nor the verb ἱεροποιεῖν formed from it should, by themselves, be taken to mean that the official necessarily performed sacrifices.[109]

---

102 *I. Rhamnous* II.31.17–18. Cf. *I. Rhamnous* II.54. On hieropoioi in the demes in general, see Whitehead, 1986.142–3.

103 The nature of these προτέλεια, the identity of these hieropoioi, and much else of this text are uncertain. See commentary on *I. Eleusis* 13.

104 *IG* II^2 1199.1–6 of 320/19.

105 For this common function of the hieropoioi, see also Lambert, 1993, T4 of a phratry and Schwenk #13.2–6 of the citizen orgeones of Bendis.

106 *IG* I^3 82.

107 On the two separate Asclepieia in this text, see Parker, 2005.462.

108 See above, p. 67.

109 The verb ἱεροποιεῖν seems to mean simply "to serve as a hieropoios," sometimes intransitively with or without the name of the deity served in the dative (no dative, *SEG* 25.221 of ca. 350–330 and *IG* II^2 2932 of 342/1; with deities, Athena and Zeus Olympios, Schwenk #77.6–7, 15–16 of 324/3, and the Semnai, Dem. 21.115), or with the *heorte* in the accusative (Mysteries, *Agora* 15.38.83 of 341/0; Athenaia, *IG* II^2 1937.1–2 of 156/5; Romaia, *IG* II^2 1938.1 of 149/8). τὴν ἑορτήν is restored as its object in *SEG* 32.216.3 and τὴν θυσίαν in *IG* I^3 82.17. ἱεροποιεῖν and θυεῖν are occasionally paired, as in Antiphon 6.45 and Dem. 21.114, and this suggests a difference in the two activities, or, at the least, that being a hieropoios did not necessarily involve sacrificing. *IG* II^3 369 of 325/4 is too fragmentary to allow any

Ephebes and Their Kosmetes

No later than 127/6 the ephebes began their year of service with their "enrollment" (ἐγγραφαί) that consisted, at least in part, of sacrificing, together with the priest of Demos and the Charites, the exegetai, and their kosmetes, their *eisiteteria* to Demos and the Charites in the Prytaneion.[110] During their year of service they regularly sacrificed to Dionysus at the City Dionysia[111] and in Piraeus at the Dionysia there.[112] The ephebes also traveled to Salamis, every year it seems, to sacrifice at the Aianteia,[113] and, most years, to Zeus Tropaios.[114] Other ephebic sacrifices appear occasionally, recorded for only one or two years: to Amphiaraus at Oropus, Artemis Mounychia, Asclepius and Hermes on Salamis, Athena Nike, Athena Polias, Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, Megaloi Theoi, Mother of the Gods at the Galaxia, Semnai, "the gods holding Attica," and at the Chalkeia, Eleusinia, and the Mysteries.[115]

---

real conclusions, but there hieropoioi of the Panathenaia are honored ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης and there is no surviving mention of a sacrifice.

110 On the cult of Demos and the Charites in general and on its relationship to the ephebes, see Monaco, 2001 and Mikalson, 1998.172–9. On the *eisiteteria* of the ephebes, see Deshours, 2011.170–1.

111 *SEG* 15.104.15–16 of 127/6, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.12–14 of 122/1, *IG* II^2 1008.14–16 of 118/7, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.19–21, *IG* II^2 1011.11, 66–7, 75–6 of 106/5, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.17–19 of 101/0, and *IG* II^2 1029.11–12 of 94/3.

112 *SEG* 15.104.24–6, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.19–21, *IG* II^2 1011.12, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.16–17, and *IG* II^2 1029.10–11.

113 *SEG* 15.104.21–3, 129–30, *IG* II^3 1313.21–22, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.30–2, 75–7, *IG* II^2 1008.22–4, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.22–6, *IG* II^2 1011.17–18, 55, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.24–6, and *IG* II^{2}1029.14–16. On the ephebes and the Aianteia, see Mikalson, 1998.183–4.

114 *SEG* 15.104.21–2, *IG* II^3 1313.20–1, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.28–9, *IG* II^2 1008.17–18, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.22–3, *Hesp. Suppl.*15, #6.27–8.

115 Amphiaraus, *IG* II^3 1313.18–19, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.27–8, 70–1; Artemis Mounychia, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.21, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.22; Asclepius on Salamis, *SEG* 15.104.23, *IG* II^3 1313.22–3, and *IG* II^2 1011.17, 55; Hermes on Salamis, *IG* II^3 1313.22–23; Athena Nike, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.14–15; Athena Polias, *IG* II^2 930.6 of ca. 150; Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, *IG* II^2 1008.21–2, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.21–22, and *IG* II^2 1030.23; Megaloi Theoi, *IG* II^2 1008.18–19, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.21; Mother of the Gods, *IG* II^2 1011.13; Semnai, *IG* II^3 1332.17 of 171/0; "the gods holding Attica," *SEG* 15.104.24, and, probably, the gods of *IG* II^3 1313.26–7; at Chalkeia, *IG* II^2 930.3; at Eleusinia, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.16; and at Mysteries, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.10–11, *IG* II^2 1029.8, and 1030.7–9. On the activities of the ephebes listed here see Deshours, 2011.155–77 and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.

Of these many sacrifices by the ephebes, only the *eisiteteria* were specifically "theirs." All others are tied to long-established cults. We should view these much as we do the ephebes' attendance at the Ekklesia, as an introduction into participation into polis matters, here religious matters. In each case their sacrifices no doubt accompanied others that were more central and traditionally and annually made by officials of the specific cult. And, it should be noted, all involved only polis cults.

Of the various officials supervising the ephebes usually only the kosmetes was involved in their sacrifices,[116] and clearly he supervised all their sacrificial activities. He sacrificed the *eisiteteria* with them (see above), and, more generally, made "all the sacrifices" with them.[117] Sometimes his sacrifices to specific gods are described, to Ajax, Dionysus at the City Dionysia, and Zeus Tropaios.[118] Among the ephebic officials only the kosmetes was praised for his εὐσέβεια.

A persistent concern was that for the ephebes and their kosmetai τὰ ἱερά be καλά (καλλιερεῖν) in their sacrifices:[119] in the *eisiteteria*,[120] at the sacrifices in the sanctuaries in the countryside,[121] at the Dionysia in Piraeus and in the city,[122] on Salamis,[123] and more generally in "all the other sacrifices" they made.[124]

The ephebes may have made some of these sacrifices in other years, even in years for which we have records, but they were simply not included in the ephebic activities deemed worthy of mention. The individual sacrifices do stand, however, in obvious contrast to regular sacrifices to Demos and the Charites, Ajax, and Dionysus.

116 Only once are the paideutai included at the *eisiteteria* (*IG* II^2 1011.33–5), although not mentioned in the first description of the same sacrifice (lines 5–7). The διδάσκαλοι are listed as present at "all the sacrifices" in *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.30–2 and are restored in *IG* II^2 1029.19.

117 *SEG* 15.104.84–8, *IG* II^3 1313.85–7, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.66–9, *IG* II^2 1008.58–9, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.60–3, *IG* II^2 1011.39–40, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.30–2, 99–100, and *IG* II^2 1029.18–19.

118 Ajax, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.72–3; Dionysus, *SEG* 15.104.107–10, 120–3, *IG* II^2 1011.66–9, 76–8; and Zeus Tropaios, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.71.

119 On the meaning of the phrase τὰ ἱερὰ καλά and of καλλιερεῖν, see Chapter 4 and Appendix 3.

120 *IG* II^2 1008.4–7, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.5–8, and *IG* II^2 1029.4–6.

121 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.24–6 and 65–67.

122 *IG* II^2 1008.13–16, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.16–19, and *IG* II^2 1029.10–12.

123 *IG* II^3 1313.95 and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.24.

124 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.67, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.30–32 and 99–100, and *IG* II^2 1029.18–19. Cf. *SEG* 29.116.15–16.

Summary of Attested Sacrifices by Non-Priestly Polis and Deme Officials

The frequency of sacrifice (annually, regularly, etc.) is sometimes assured by the evidence and is sometimes deduced from the description of one individual's sacrifice. An asterisk indicates that the only source is the idiosyncratic *SEG* 21.469C which records the refurbishing and reorganization of the Apollo cult in 129/8. Whether all or any of the officials named in this document made annual sacrifices as described there in previous times is uncertain, perhaps unlikely given the lack of other attestations. Finally, this is a summary only of "attested" sacrifices, and there were no doubt more sacrifices by some of these officials but of them we have no record.

Administrative Officials

Archons (as a group)

Sacrifices, at the end of their term, on behalf of their successor(s)

Archon

At City Dionysia (annually)
At Thargelia, with basileus and strategoi* (annually)
"The other sacrifices it was appropriate for him to sacrifice" (annually)

Basileus

In City Eleusinion and at Eleusis (annually)
To Apollo Patroös, with archon and strategoi* (annually)
To Apollo, with herald of Areopagus Council, thesmothetai, and priest* (annually)

Polemarch

To Artemis Agrotera and Enyalios (annually)
To Harmodios and Aristogiton (annually)

Thesmothetai

To Apollo, with herald of Areopagus Council, basileus, and priest* (annually)

Tamias of Boule

To Apollo, with tamias of grain fund* (annually)

Tamias of Grain Fund

To Apollo, with tamias of Boule* (annually)

Tamias of Stratiotic Fund
To Apollo* (annually)

Herald of Areopagus Council
To Apollo, with basileus, thesmothetai, and priest* (annually)

Demarchs
Of Eleusis (all annually)
To Hermes
To Demeter and Kore at Haloa and Chloia
To Dionysus at Eleusinian Dionysia
At Kalamaia
Of Hagnous (?)
To Zeus, the Plerosia (annually)
Of Ikarion
To Dionysus (annually)
To other gods to whom it was πάτριον to sacrifice (annually)
Of Marathonian Tetrapolis (all annually)
To heroes and heroines
To Achaia
To Moirai
To Hyttenios
To Kourotrophos
To Tritopatores
To Acamantes
Of Rhamnous
To "all the gods and heroes"
To Antigonus Gonatas (annually)

Legislative Officials

Bouleutai
At City Dionysia (annually)
Sacrifices associated with the Eleusinian ἀπαρχαί (annually)
Sacrifices upon "entering other sanctuaries" (regularly)
The *eisiteteria*, by the hieropoios (probably regularly)
Sacrifices "from the oracles," probably in Chalcis, by three bouleutai (once)

Prytaneis and their Tamias
To Apollo Prostaterios, Artemis Boulaia, and Artemis Phosphoros, routinely before meetings of the Ekklesia, by their tamias

Annually, if sacrifice fell during their prytany
To Apollo, the ἐξημηναῖον
To Apollo Patroös
To Athena Archegetis at Chalkeia
To Demeter and Kore at Stenia
To Mother of the Gods at Galaxia
To Theseus
To Zeus at Kronia
To Zeus Ktesios
To Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira
On a special occasion
To Athena Nike, Agathe Tyche, and the Soteres (Demetrius and his father)

Military Officials

Strategoi
Multiple sacrifices, with taxiarchs, to unnamed recipients (regularly)
Libations, at City Dionysia (annually)
To Apollo, with basileus and archon* (annually)
Individual Strategoi of Garrisoned Troops
At Rhamnous
To Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira
To Nemesis and Themis
To Aphrodite Hegemone
At Eleusis
To Demeter and Kore at Haloa
To Demeter and Kore at Eleusinia

Taxiarchs
Multiple sacrifices, with strategoi, to unnamed recipients (regularly)

Hipparchs
Eisiteteria, to Poseidon (Hippios?) and others (annually)

Phylarchs
Multiple sacrifices, to unnamed recipients

Trierarch
At Rhamnous
To Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira
To Nemesis, with strategos and hieropoioi

Lay Officials

Agonothetai

At City Dionysia (annually)

To Theseus at Theseia (annually)

Epimeletai

At City Dionysia (annually)

To Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira in the city and in Piraeus (annually)

To Asclepius and Hygieia (annually)

Of Mysteries

To Demeter and Kore, at Mysteries at Eleusis and Agrai (annually)

Epistatai

Of Eleusis

At Mysteries (annually)

At Dionysia in Piraeus (annually)

At Lenaia (annually)

Of Asclepieion in Piraeus

προθύματα to Asclepius (annually)

Exegetai

Eisiteteria of ephebes, with ephebes, kosmetes, and priest, to Demos and Charites (annually)

Hieropoioi

"Of the Year" or "Those of the Annual Panathenaia"

To Athena Polias, Athena Nike, Athena Hygieia at Panathenaia (annually)

Other

To Dionysus, at Dionysia in Piraeus, with priest (annually)

To Nemesis at Rhamnous, with strategos and taxiarch (annually)

προτέλεια, at either Eleusinia or Mysteries (annually)

Ephebes and Their Kosmetes

Annually

Eisiteteria, with kosmetes and priest of Demos and Charites, to Demos and Charites

To Dionysus, at Dionysia in city and in Piraeus

To Ajax, at Aianteia

To Zeus Tropaios on Salamis

To Amphiaraus at Oropus

At least once

To Artemis Mounychia
To Asclepius on Salamis
To Athena Nike
To Athena Polias
To Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira
To Megaloi Theoi
To Mother of Gods at Galaxia
To Semnai
At Chalkeia
At Eleusinian Mysteries

Named Rituals and *Heortai* at Which Individuals, Apart from Priests and Priestesses, Sacrificed

Listed below are those individuals, apart from priests, who sacrificed at explicitly named rituals and *heortai*. Under some sacrifices to certain deities may be concealed *heortai*, such as the Amphiaraia for Amphiaraus and the Nemesia for Nemesis, and these have not been included.

Aianteia: ephebes, and, one time each, archon, strategoi, and epimeletai
Chalkeia: ephebes and prytaneis
Chloia: demarch of Eleusis
City Dionysia: archon, agonothetai, Boule, ephebes, epimeletai, and libations by the strategoi
Dionysia at Eleusis: demarch
Dionysia at Ikarion: demarch
Dionysia in Piraeus: ephebes, epistatai of Eleusis, hieropoioi
Eleusinia: ephebes, epistatai of Eleusis, strategos of a garrison, hieropoioi (?)
Galaxia: ephebes, prytaneis
Haloa: demarch of Eleusis, strategos of a garrison
Kalamaia: demarch of Eleusis
Lenaia: epistatai of Eleusis
Mysteries at Agrai: epimeletai of Mysteries, epistatai of Eleusis
Mysteries at Eleusis: ephebes, epimeletai of Mysteries, epistatai of Eleusis, hieropoioi (?)
Nemesia: demarch of Rhamnous
Panathenaia: hieropoioi "for the year" or "those of the annual Panathenaia"
Plerosia: demarch of Hagnous (?)

Stenia: prytaneis
Thargelia: archon,* basileus,* agonothetai,* strategoi*
Theseia: agonothetai, prytaneis

Certain sacrifices are termed "appropriate" for certain groups or individuals, and the usual formulae are αἱ θυσίαι αἱ καθήκουσαι (ἑαυτοῖς) and θυσίαι ὅσαι καθῆκον with some variations of word order. "Appropriate" seems the best translation for the various forms of καθήκειν, in that it includes connotations both of "fitting for" and "belonging to" that are found for καθήκειν (See LSJ s.v. καθήκειν.).[125] Most commonly and very often the regular sacrifices by the prytaneis and by their tamias are so designated from earliest to latest times.[126] So, too, are commonly described sacrifices by the ephebes, as well as, less often, their torch races.[127] The same formula is used also, one time for each, for sacrifices by the priestess of Aglauros,[128] the priest of Apollo Pythios, the priestess of the Thesmophoroi at Melite, the epimeletai of the Mysteries, and the gymnasiarch of the Salaminians.[129] It may or may not be relevant that no sacrifices are described as "appropriate" for any administrative official. For an archon, a basileus, an agonothetes, and once for the priest of Asclepius a different formula is employed.[130] θυσίαι ὅσας αὐτὸν (or αὐτῷ) προσῆκεν (θῦσαι) may best be taken as "sacrifices which it was appropiate for him to sacrifice." Given the date

125 I offer here a more specific meaning for the phrase and to whom it applies than does, e.g., Deshours (304), "les sacrifices qui conviennent." For a *nomos* which may have controlled some aspects of which sacrifices "belonged" to whom, see Chapter 7.

126 Of the many examples, for the prytaneis as a group, *Agora* 15.78.11–2 of 273/2, 115.17–19 of 234/3, and 240.15–16 of 140/39; for their tamias, *Agora* 15.85.1–4 of mid-III BC and *IG* II^3 1168.44–7 of 211/0 and 1153.45–50 of 222/1.

127 Some examples, of sacrifices, *IG* II^3 1256.13–14 of 196/5, 1313.87 of 175/4, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.15–16 of 122/1, *IG* II^2 1011.14 of 106/5, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.30–2 of 101/0, and *IG* II^2 1029.18–19 of 94/3; of torch races, *IG* II^3 1256.10–11, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.11 and 22, and *IG* II^2 1011.9–10.

128 The priestess of Aglauros τὰς θυσίας ἔθυσε τὰς προσηκούσας (*SEG* 33.115.27–8), with a variant for καθηκούσας found in this formula only in restorations, as *I. Rhamnous* II.50.22.

129 Apollo Pythios, *SEG* 21.469C.53 of 129/8; thesmophoroi, *Agora* 16.277.1–4 of ca. 180; of epimeletai of Mysteries, *I. Eleusis* 192.9–14 of 249/8; and of gymnasiarch of Salaminians, *Hesp*. 15, #1.5–6 of 131/0.

130 Archon, *IG* II^2 668.11–12 of 282/1; basileus, *SEG* 45.101.25–7 of 293/2; agonothetes, *SEG* 39.125.10–12 (restored) of 255/4; and priest of Asclepius, *IG* II^2 1163.5–6 of 284/4.

of the attestations of this latter formula, almost all from early III BC, it may just be, however, an earlier form of the mostly later αἱ θυσίαι αἱ καθήκουσαι.[131]

Aristotle (*Pol.* 6.1322b18–29) offers one way to categorize the officials who sacrificed, a passage perfectly explained by D. Whitehead (1986.180):

> Aristotle distinguishes between two kinds of religious superintendence (ἐπιμέλεια ἡ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς). One comprises priests (ἱερεῖς), superintendents of the fabric of temples and other cult duties (ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τοῦ σῴζεσθαί τε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ἀνορθοῦσθαι τὰ πίπτοντα τῶν οἰκοδομημάτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα τέτακται πρὸς τοὺς θεούς), *hieropoioi*, temple guardians (ναοφύλακες), and tamiai of sacred monies (ταμίαι τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων). The other consists of officials who perform "all the communal sacrifices which the law [or custom?] does not assign to the priests" (τὰς θυσίας . . . τὰς κοινὰς πάσας, ὅσας μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἀποδίδωσιν ὁ νόμος) but "to those who derive their office from the common hearth" (ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς ἑστίας ἔχουσι τὴν τιμήν); that is, secular officials whose functions involve, *inter alia*, the offering of sacrifices on behalf of the whole community which they represent.

If we apply Aristotle's description of Greek practices in general to the Athenians, the sacrifices by the priests, hieropoioi, epimeletai, and agonothetai would fall into the first category. Those "appropiate to" the prytaneis, archons, basileis, and such were those of the second type, of secular officials who performed their sacrifices in addition to their primary legislative and administrative duties.

---

131 Private associations, but, interestingly, almost exclusively those made up of citizens (orgeones), also occasionally made use of these formulae: the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods, *IG* II^2 1327.8 of 178/7; orgeones of Aphrodite, *MDAI* 66.228.4.4 of 138/7; and orgeones of an unknown deity, *Agora* 16.235.5 of late III BC. On citizen participation in the Aphrodite cult, see Mikalson, 1998.278. *IG* II^2 1315.7–8 of 210/9, again of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods, offers a slight variant, θυσίας ἃς καθῆκεν θύειν. Only one group of non-Athenians, the devotees of Aphrodite, uses one of these formulae, θυσίας ὅσας προσῆκεν αὐτῷ (*IG* II^2 1290.6–7 of mid-III BC).

The phrase is rare in literary texts, first found in Diod. S. 1.23.5, τὰς καθηκούσας αὐτῷ ποιήσασθαι θυσίας, and there the dative refers to the god, not to the sacrificer as in our texts.

CHAPTER 4

Who Reports What?

What is a Report?

Of the various compounds of ἀγγέλλειν, ἀπαγγέλλειν appears to be the specific term in inscriptions for making a report to the Boule or Ekklesia.[1] It is used of reports by ambassadors, strategoi, and theoroi, and of the many reports concerning sacrifices by prytaneis and others described below.[2] The ἀπαγγελίαι ("formal reports") should be distinguished from the simple description of religious activities so common in the ephebic decrees and elsewhere.[3] The distinction may be seen clearly in *IG* II^2 1011 where the religious activities of the ephebes are described at considerable length as are their secular activities, but the kosmetes reports (ἀπαγγέλλειν) on the sacrifices he made with the ephebes (lines 66–9, 75–8). After simple descriptions of religious activities, those who performed them are simply praised.

Such formal reports were made first to the Boule, and the Boule then forwarded them to the Ekklesia, proposing that the Ekklesia "accept" (δέχεσθαι) them.[4] The prytaneis regularly made such reports, but we learn nothing more of the procedures. But it is once said of a priest of Asclepius of 165/4 that he "approached the Boule" ([πρό]σοδον ποιησάμενος πρὸς τὴμ βουλήν) to make his report (*SEG* 18.22.5–7). This may indicate that some such reports, like those of the prytaneis, were expected and regular parts of the Boule's agenda in this period, but others were occasional, initiated by individuals.

---

1 παραγγέλλειν means "to order," as in orders by strategoi (*IG* II^3 316), prytaneis (*IG* II^2 120.11), or a committee (*I. Eleusis* 196). ἐπαγγέλλειν is used in two contexts, of the reporting of a need to another party in the context of a treaty (*IG* II^2 97 and R&O #6), and of the "announcement" of the Eleusinian *spondophoroi* (*Agora* 16.48 and 56. Cf. *I. Eleusis* 28a). ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι, the middle, is widely used of promises of future action (e.g., *IG* II^2 653, 908, and 1215). For the distinction between ἀπαγγέλλειν and ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι in one text, see, e.g., *IG* II^3 298 or *I. Eleusis* 196.

2 Ambassadors, *IG* II^3 298 (cf. *IG* II^3 1147); strategoi, *IG* II^3 1334; and theoroi, restored in *IG* II^2 1054. The simplex ἀγγέλλειν is restored in the relatively early report by ambassadors in *IG* I^3 227.

3 For ephebic decrees, *IG* II^3 1313, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26, *IG* II^2 1008, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30, *IG* II^2 1011, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6, and *IG* II^2 1029. For an example of others, *IG* II^3 1164.

4 On these reports to the Boule, see Rhodes, 1972.132.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_006

Who Reports?

The first assured report of the numerous formal reports by prytaneis to the Boule concerning sacrifices they made dates to 273/2 (*Agora* 15.78).[5] Similar reports are then attested regularly until the Roman period when they abruptly stop. The reports by the prytaneis are more numerous than all the reports of the other groups and alone are frequent enough to indicate that they were made on a regular basis.[6] The priest of Asclepius also reported to the Boule concerning sacrifices, in 328/7, 244/3, 165/4, and 137/6,[7] and their frequency, compared to other, non-prytany reports, is noteworthy. Twice, in 127/6 and 106/5, the kosmetes of the ephebes made a similar report of sacrifices he made with the ephebes (*SEG* 15.104 and *IG* II^2 1011). The archon may, too, have made occasional reports.[8] The reports of these officials are frequent enough to suggest occasional reports but nothing like the regular ones of the prytaneis.

All other attestations suggest reports concerning a single event: the archon in 282/1; the demarch of Eleusis in 165/4; the epimeletai of the Mysteries in 267/6 and ca. 215; the agonothetes of the City Dionysia in 252/1; the priest of Amphiaraus in 273/2; the priest of Zeus Soter of the Stoa of Zeus in 272/1 (?); the priest of Zeus Soter of Piraeus and the epimeletai in 163/2; the priest of Dionysus in Piraeus and the hieropoioi in ca. 330; theoroi in 281/0 and in II BC; the priestess of Athena Polias in 255/4; the priestess of Aglauros in 250/49; and a strategos ca. 234.[9]

---

5 For a translation and background of this text, see Mikalson, 1998.113–16. The formula has been restored in *Agora* 15.76 of 279/8, and a similar report, but with λέγειν and not ἀγγέλλειν, has been restored in *Agora* 15.71 of 283/2. For both λέγουσι and ἀπαγγέλουσι in the same document, referring apparently to the same action, see *IG* II^3 416.

6 Naiden (2013.210) is probably correct in claiming that "No session of the Assembly could occur without the *prutaneis* assuring the Demos that the preliminary sacrifices had proved acceptable, so reports of this kind were even more frequent than the record suggests."

7 *IG* II^3 359.95–7 (On this text see Schwenk #54), *SEG* 18.19.9, *SEG* 18.22, and 18.26. *SEG* 18.19 (Lambert, 2012.103–6, #9) contains two relevant decrees, both probably for the same priest in the archonship of Lysiades (244/3), despite the various restorations attempted. In the interpretation of the text I follow Lewis, 1985.

8 *IG* II^2 668, 781, and *IG* II^3 1298.

9 The demarch of Eleusis, *I. Eleusis* 229; epimeletai of Mysteries, *I. Eleusis* 181 and *IG* II^3 1188.6–7; agonothetes of City Dionysia, *IG* II^2 780; priest of Amphiaraus, *SEG* 32.100; priest of Zeus Soter of Stoa of Zeus, Lambert, 2012.99–100, #6; priest of Zeus Soter of Piraeus and epimeletai, *IG* II^2 783; priest of Dionysus and hieropoioi, *IG* II^3 416; theoroi, *IG* II^2 1054, *IG* II^3 1372.17–21, and *Agora* 16.182.9–19; priestess of Athena Polias, *IG* II^2 776; priestess of Aglauros, *SEG* 33.115; and a strategos, *I. Eleusis* 196.22–4. Clinton (2005–2008.II.259) thinks that the custom of the epimeletai of the Mysteries making such reports may have lapsed by 215.

What Do They Report?

From 273/2 (*Agora* 15.78) or probably a decade earlier, 283/2 (*Agora* 15.71), for nearly two hundred years until just before the sack of Sulla (95/4, *Agora* 15.261),[10] the prytaneis regularly reported to the Boule on the sacrifices they made before meetings of the Ekklesia.[11] Usually the prytaneis reported on only these sacrifices, but on three occasions they reported also on sacrifices they made at other religious events occurring during their prytany.[12] The prytaneis reported, in an unvarying formula, "the good things" (τὰ ἀγαθά) that "occurred" in their sacrifices "for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos," and they occasionally added to the Boule and Demos other individuals or groups as beneficiaries.[13] The polis then voted "to accept" (δέχεσθαι) the "good things" reported.[14]

The four best surviving reports of the priest of Asclepius show some variety. The earliest, *IG* II^3 359 of 328/7, and *SEG* 18.19 of 244/3 follow the prytany

---

IG II^2 1000 gives such a report by a priest of an unknown god. To complete our survey of "reports," hieropoioi or priests of private associations (κοινά) reported to fellow members their sacrifices: the archeranistes to fellow thiasotai (*IG* II^2 1297 of 236/5) and the priestess of Syrian Aphrodite to orgeones (*IG* II^2 1337 of 97/6). On these two cults, see Mikalson, 1998.148–9 and 277–8, and on the archeranistes, Arnaoutoglou, 1994.107–110. The demarch of Ikarion also reported to demesmen on his sacrifices (*SEG* 22.117.1–2 of ca. 330).

10 The date of *Agora* 15.261 is disputed. See *SEG* 44.53.

11 *Agora* 15.78 (273/2), 89 (259/8), 115 (234/3), *IG* II^3 1139 (227/6), 1149 (225/4), 1155 (219/8), 1162 (214/3), 1165 (213/2), 1299 (181/0), 1304 (180/79 ?), 1310 (178/7), 1316 (175/4), 1324 (174/3), 1328 (173/2), 1333 (169/8), *Agora* 15. 219 (164/3), 238 (145/4), 240 (140/39), 243 (135/4), and 246 (131/0). As evidence here and throughout I offer only those texts where the text survives wholly or sufficiently so that the restorations are certain. I do not include the many restored texts even though in most cases the restorations are highly probable. Here, however, the first and last texts in the series (*Agora* 15.71 and 261) both depend on restorations and are not included in the list above.

12 *Agora* 15.78, 115, and 240. That the additional sacrifices were part of their formal report is indicated by the τε of *Agora* 15.78.5.

13 As recorded in all the texts of Chapter 4, note 11, except *IG* II^3 1155.6–9 where "health and safety" is missing, but note 42–6. In *Agora* 15.115.14 τὰ ἄλλα is now properly read as τὰ ἀγαθά (Henry, 1980.94). These sacrifices suffice, by the way, to disprove Sourvinou-Inwood's claim (1988.261) that "it appears that sacrifices for, and on behalf of, the polis are always performed by a priest."

14 The phrase for this, common in the inscriptions, is not found in the literary texts, but there δέχεσθαι is occasionally associated with oracles and omens, see, e.g., Hdt. 1.48.1, 1.63.1, 9.91.1 and Ar. *Plut*. 63.

formula, that is, that "the good things" occurred in sacrifices he made to Asclepius and associated gods for the "health and safety" of the Boule and Demos. In *SEG* 18.22 of 165/4 the report is that, in the sacrifices he made, τὰ ἱερά were καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια for all Athenians and for those inhabiting the cities of the Athenians. In *SEG* 18.26 of 137/6 the priest reports sacrifices on several occasions, at the [*eisiteteria*] to Asclepius, Hygieia, and "the other gods," and at the Asclepieia, Epidauria, and Heroa, all "on behalf of the Boule and Demos," and [τὰ ἱερά] were [καλὰ καὶ] σωτήρια.[15]

The two forms of reports in the priest of Asclepius decrees, of "the good things" that happened and that τὰ ἱερά were καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια, are paralleled in other attested reports. "The good things" occur in the reports of the kosmetai of 127/6 and 106/5; of the archon in 282/1; of an agonothetes in 252/1; of hieropoioi and the priest of Dionysus in Piraeus. All of the above sacrifices were made to "Dionysus and the other gods." And the epimeletai of the Mysteries gave the same report of their sacrifices at the Mysteries at Agrai, as did the priest of Zeus Soter, the priestess of Athena Polias, and the priestess of Aglauros.[16] Reports that τὰ ἱερά were καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια come only, in addition to the above noted reports of the priest of Asclepius, from another priest, a hipparch, theoroi, and the demarch of Eleusis.[17]

Some reports are that ἀγαθά occurred in the sacrifices, others that τὰ ἱερά were καλά, and we may reasonably conclude that they refer to the same thing, i.e., τὰ ἀγαθά that are being reported are that τὰ ἱερά were καλά. This is confirmed by the one example where both phrases are used in the same text: in *IG* II^2 1000 the priest reports that [τὰ ἱερὰ καλὰ καὶ σω]τήρια, and the Boule accepts τὰ ἀγαθά which he reports.

But what were the ἱερά that were καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια? Theophrastus' "Man of Petty Ambition" (*Char.* 21) is proud that as a prytanis he got to report that the ἱερὰ were καλά at the Galaxia, and he bid the Athenians, δέχεσθε τὰ ἀγαθά. Diggle in his edition of the *Characters* of Theophastus (2004.125) translates this as follows: "The sacrifices were propitious. We beg you to accept your

15 On this text and these *heortai*, see Deshours, 2011.150–3. For a restoration to offer many parallels with *SEG* 18.26, see *SEG* 18.27.

16 Kosmetai, *SEG* 15.104 and *IG* II^2 1011; archon, *IG* II^2 668; agonothetes, *IG* II^2 780; hieropoioi and priest of Dionysus, *IG* II^3 416; epimeletai of the Mysteries, *I. Eleusis* 181; priest of Zeus Soter, Lambert, 2012.99–100, #6; priestess of Athena Polias, *IG* II^2 776; and priestess of Aglauros, *SEG* 33.115.

17 Priest, *IG* II^2 1000.7–8 of mid-II BC; hipparch, *IG* II^3 1281.15–16 (with Habicht's restoration) of 187/6; theoroi, *IG* II^2 1054.13–14 of ca. 125–100; and demarch, *I. Eleusis* 229.11–12 of 165/4. The phrase is largely restored in *IG* II^3 1188.7–8 for epimeletai of the Mysteries.

blessings."[18] We have already shown that δέχεσθαι τὰ ἀγαθά should be taken to mean "accept 'the good things' that occurred in the sacrifice," i.e., that τὰ ἱερά were καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια. The introduction of "blessings" here is inappropriate.[19] Likewise, I think, "sacrifices" for ἱερά is wrong. I propose that in these expressions τὰ ἱερά are the sacrificial victims, not the ritual of sacrifice.[20] In the texts where our phrase τὰ ἱερὰ . . .καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια occurs, the sacrifices are previously described, all in terms of θύσιαι.[21] τὰ ἱερὰ . . .καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια is a happy result of the sacrifice, not the sacrifice itself.[22] It is noteworthy that we never have, for example, ἡ θυσία ἦν καλὴ καὶ σωτηρία. The sacrificial victims, τὰ ἱερά, are καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια because, when examined for omens in the course of the sacrificial ritual, as described by Van Straten, they were found to be "sound" (καλά) and showing good omens.[23] These good omens in turn promise success of the sacrifice and of the accompanying prayer ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑγιείας καὶ σωτηρίας. In these phrases ἱερά should be translated as "sacrificial victims," not as "sacrifices." The attention in these reports is directed to the victims and their divinatory potential, not to the ritual of sacrifice.

If τὰ ἱερά means "sacrificial victims" in the above phrases, it quite probably means the same in this extremely common formulaic statement as seen in *I. Eleusis* 229.14–17: τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέχεσθαι τὰ γεγονότα ἐ[ν] *τοῖς ἱεροῖς οἷς ἔθυσε* ἐφ᾽ ὑγιείαι καὶ σωτηρίαι. . . .[24] The italicized phrase can easily be taken to mean "in the sacrificial victims which he sacrificed." In these texts there is a clear distinction. When sacrifices themselves are being discussed, the relevant term

18 Parker in 1996.247 translates the phrase as "accept the benefits arising from the sacrifice," but in 2005.67 as "accept the good things that occurred in the sacrifice."

19 τὰ ἀγαθά as "good things" in general is more associated with prayer, as in Hdt. 6.111, Xen. *Mem*. 1.3.2, Ar. *Thesm*. 310, *Eccl*. 781, Arist., frag. 532 (R^3), and Ephorus, *FGrHist* 70 F 16.

20 In contrast to the more common view that τὰ ἱερά may be both, as most recently stated explicitly by Naiden (2015.467): "In the common phrase, *hiera kala*, the word *hiera* referred not only to victims, but also to the chief features of the act."

21 *SEG* 18.22.7–10, 18.26.13–16, and *I. Eleusis* 229.6–11.

22 Lambert (2002.382 n. 5), by contrast, would have ἱερεῖον as the "normal term" for "sacrificial victim" and ἱερά commonly as "sacrifices," but occasionally "doing duty for ἱερεῖον."

23 Van Straten, 1995.190–2. For his good emphasis on the "beauty" of the καλά, see Chapter 1. For more on ἱερὰ καλά, see Appendix 3.

24 Of over 80 possible examples, these are sufficient to illustrate the formula. From the prytany decrees, *IG* II^3 1162.15–16, *Agora* 15.78.8–11 and 115.14–16. From the ephebic decrees, *IG* II^2 1011.67–9 and 77–8 and *SEG* 15.104.108–9, 121–3. And, from other types, *IG* II^3 416.11–16, *I. Eleusis* 181.15–19, *IG* II^2 668.6–10, and *IG* II^3 1188.23–5.

is θυσίαι, as in the formula ὑπὲρ τῶν θυσιῶν ὧν ἔθυον,[25] and here only the fact of making the sacrifice is relevant. With ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς οἷς ἔθυσε, the ἀγαθά are reported. One never has ἀπαγγέλλειν τὰ ἀγαθὰ τὰ γεγονότα ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις αἷς ἔθυσαν.[26] θυσίαι are "sacrifices," τὰ ἱερά are, in these contexts, the animals sacrificed, and it is they which determine τὰ ἀγαθά.[27]

In *all* such reports, in whichever of the two formulae, the sacrifices were made "for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos" and other parties variously included. One can be virtually certain that this phrase was in the prayers accompanying these sacrifices. Clearly, the Boule and Demos were interested primarily in, and wanted and accepted reports about, those sacrifices made for their own health and safety and that of the Athenian people. They wanted to know that in these sacrifices τὰ ἱερά were καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια. And, of course, it is only fitting that sacrifices for "health and *safety*" be reported as σωτήρια. All of this may be seen as proof and a result of the relatively new, since about 330 BC, major concern with the "health and safety" of the polis. I have discussed elsewhere what "health" and "safety" probably entailed in this context in Athens (1998.42–5, 132–4, 294–6) and offer here only a brief summary of that. "Health," in these polis texts, was probably not, or not only, a matter of diseases and broken bones, matters for which individual Athenians had private access to healing gods such as Asclepius and Amphiaraus and even local heroes. It more likely was a concern for the "things necessary for a healthy life," things such as food and other essentials which at times in the Hellenistic period were in desperately short supply. "Safety" probably did not concern so much the preservation or restoration of democracy, although the specification of the Demos and Boule as beneficiaries may suggest that. Other beneficiaries were also the children and wives of the Demos, and this suggests more a personal, physical safety, safety from the dangers of wars that so threatened all Greek cities in this period. Emily Kearns (1990.325) sees the areas of Greek life requiring "safety" or "deliverance" as breaking down into two groups: for the individual, death, disgrace, illness, injury, and poverty; for the city, defeat (in war), plague,

25 *Agora* 15.78.4–6 and 115.9–12 are only two among many possible examples of this formula, but are useful because they contain both formulae and offer clear cases for comparison. Cf. *IG* II² 1165.6–7.

26 Even phrases like ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις and ἐν τῇ θυσίᾳ are uncommon in the literary sources (e.g., P. *Isth*.5.30, Isoc. 5.117, 16.34, Xen. *Ages*. 8.7, Pl. *Smp*. 197d, *Ion* 535d2, *Rep*. 5.468d) until Plutarch and even then are not in the context of divination.

27 A similar distinction between θυσία and τὰ ἱερά may be seen also in Pl. *Rep*. 3.394a and *Lg*. 7.800b. The ἱερὰ ἄθυτα of Lysias 30.20 should probably be "sacrificial victims not sacrificed," not "sacrifices not made."

famine, civil disturbance, and natural disasters. One can see how the phrase "health and safety" in public documents might come to be used to encompass all of the latter group.

Only the prytaneis reported regularly, and they were, of course, government officials reporting on their sacrifices on mostly governmental occasions, before meetings of the Ekklesia. Other religious and lay officials reported occasionally, at best, and on only one type of sacrifice, that for the "health and safety of the Boule and Demos." Of the hundreds of priests of Athenian cults, only priests of Asclepius and of Zeus Soter and priestesses of Athena Polias and Aglauros reported, the last two attested only once.[28] Only the priest of Asclepius reported several times, appropriately, since the Boule was interested in sacrifices "for *health* and safety." The Dionysus of the City Dionysia, however, is equally prominent, with sacrifices to him reported by kosmetai, the archon, and an agonothetes, and here it must be remembered that this was a major polis-financed *heorte*.

---

28 Lambert's (2012.74–5) comments that "the central act for which the priest is honoured is typically the performance of sacrifices and a report on their successful outcome," and that "sacrificing for the health and preservation of the city is the core of a priest's service," may be true so far as our texts go, but are documented for only four of the hundreds of polis priests and priestesses. Horster's claim (2010.190–1) that "Starting in the late fourth century, it seems to have become obligatory for magistrates and priests (of 'public' cults) to report the successful sacrifices to the boule . . ." is badly overstated. So, too, I think, Naiden (2013.210–11) overestimates the number of such reports.

CHAPTER 5

Who Pays for What?

> The Demos knows that it is not possible for each poor person to sacrifice, feast, possess sanctuaries, have *heortai*, and have a home in a beautiful and great city, but it has discovered a way in which these things will be. They, the polis, sacrifice many sacrificial animals at public expense, but it is the Demos which feasts upon and divides up by lot the animals ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 2.9).

So the anonymous "old oligarch" of late V BC, in somewhat messy Greek and logic,[1] complains of life in Athens.[2] The evidence from IV BC indicates quite clearly that then the polis was paying, from a variety of sources, for virtually all costs of polis sacrifices, *heortai*, and sanctuaries as it no doubt did in V BC.[3] The exception in IV BC, as we will see, is that some private individuals, as choregoi, were paying substantial amounts to support *agones* of some *heortai*. It has been commonly claimed that one of the new features of Athenian religion in the Hellenistic period is that rich individuals assumed more and more of the costs of polis cult, especially of polis sacrifices, to the extent that by the end of the Hellenistic period most polis religious activities were privately financed. To test that claim, we examine in this chapter who, as public officials or private citizens, were contributing to paying which costs of polis, deme, and private cults.[4]

We include all explicit mentions of such contributions "from own funds" (ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων) and include some others, as of choregoi, where the office entailed such contributions. Others would include virtually all references to φιλοτιμία and liturgies (λειτουργίαι) on the assumption, which I now believe mistaken,

1 On this see Frisch, 1942,254–6, and hence I offer a paraphrase rather than exact translation of the passage.

2 On this pseudo-Xenophantean text, see Osborne, 2004 and Mattingly, 1997.

3 Rosivach (1994) offers excellent descriptions of the large numbers, costs, and procedures for polis, deme, and other sacrifices in Athens in IV BC and of who was paying for them. There should be much of value in Pritchard's forthcoming (2015) book on this topic.

4 As to why individuals contributed, see Chapter 13. On such contributors in general and on the areas and development of the practice, see Lambert, 2012, Hakkarainen, 1997, and Gauthier, 1985.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_007

that they necessarily refer to personal financial contributions.[5] Some, wrongly I think, also take the phrase παραστήσαντες . . .θύματα to indicate that the honorands paid for the sacrificial victims.[6] It can equally well mean that they had "presented" them to the deity, whether they had paid for them or not, and the emphasis is usually on the beauty of the victims.[7] Finally, some go so far as to assume that some simple mentions of sacrifice, for example, "the epimeletes sacrificed" or "the priest of Asclepius sacrificed" warrant the conclusion that the individual provided the offering at his or her own expense.[8] There is no evidence to support this supposition. Obviously the results would look very different if we included all such references to φιλοτιμία, liturgies, and sacrifices. We would have a great part of all sacrificial activity in polis, deme, and private cults funded by individuals throughout our period. We, therefore, limit ourselves to explicit mentions of private contributions, usually ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, or other clearly documented cases.

Polis Cults

Priests and priestesses seem rarely to have dipped into their own funds to cover the cults they served. The first certain attestation is from 237/6, when the priestess of Athena Polias was praised by the Boule for dedicating various items of clothing "from her own funds," but dedications by priests and priestesses to

5 On φιλοτιμία and liturgies not necessarily involving personal expenses, see above, pp. 23 and 42. For my previous, mistaken view, see, e.g., 1998.113–14 and 294.

6 E.g., Lambert, 2012.84 and, apparently, Aleshire, 1989.74–5. The only assured examples are in late honors of ephebes: Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.14–15 of 116/5, *SEG* 22.110.55 of 79/8, and *IG* II^2 1043.25–6 and 48 of 37/6 (?). The phrase has been almost entirely restored for priests of Asclepius in *SEG* 18.26.12 and 27.7, for the uncertainties of which restorations see Hubbe, 1959.191. Also for hieropoioi, *IG* II^3 416.24. Simple "leading to the altar" is indicated by Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.27–8, a preliminary step to, or a different view of, the παραστήσαντες in lines 15–16 of this same text. The victims are to "stand beside the altar" (e.g., Aeschin. 3.120), and the "leading to the altar" just gets them there (as in Xen. *An*. 6.1.22). For a quite different meaning of the phrase in some non-Athenian texts and in different contexts, see Robert, 1960.126–30.

7 Cf. [Pl.] *Alc*. II.149c1–4 and Xen. *An*. 6.1.22.

8 As an example, Lambert (2012.83) on sacrifices by non-priests: "Even where donations of victims are not explicitly referred to in the text of the decrees, we may perhaps assume that the prominence of sacrifices in decrees honouring non-priestly Hellenistic officials reflects the fact that, generally speaking, this was conceived as a significant locus of their euergetism."

the deity they served are common and not our concern now.[9] More noteworthy, if we can trust the restorations, is that she dispersed to the Praxiergidae 100 drachmas "from her own funds" for their ancestral sacrifice, probably at the Plynteria.[10] That she had paid out money may be the reason that her husband is also commended in this decree (*IG* II^2 776).[11] She is the only polis priest or priestess clearly attested to have contributed personal funds for polis sacrifices to his or her own deity.[12] For the years 103/2–97/6, along with many other officials, numerous Athenian priests of cults on Delos, including those of Apollo, Artemis, Roma, Anios, Sarapis, Hagne Thea, Zeus Kynthios, and Dionysus contributed, usually 100 drachmas each, for the *aparchai* for the Pythaïs, the newly re-established *theoria* from Athens to Apollo Pythios of Delphi (*SEG* 32.218). Here we have, in quite unusual circumstances, priests donating to activities of a cult other than their own.

Only very late, in 103/2–97/6, do we have the nine archons contributing, again for the Pythaïs to Delphi, a special event to which many others, including priests, government officials, and others contributed.[13] Otherwise there are no attestations of archons as a group or as individuals contributing money to cultic activities, and in fact there are few attestations for any administrative officials.

---

9 For example, in 235/4(?) the priest of Kalliste dedicated a stone altar "from his own funds" (*IG* II^2 788.12–13). On this cult see Mikalson, 1998.149. On benefactions by Athenian and other priestesses, see Connelly, 2007.192–5.

10 On the *genos* of Praxiergidae, their association with the Plynteria, and this text, see Parker, 1996.307–8.

11 On this text see Mikalson, 1998.161–4.

12 A very lucanose text may have a contribution by the priest of Zeus Soter for a sacrifice (*IG* II^2 690 of 305/4 to ca. 270). Lambert (2012.84) would have the priest of Asclepius also make financial contributions, from *IG* II^3 1386.2 and *SEG* 18.27.17, but the fragmentary condition of both allows no such conclusion. From *SEG* 18.26.12 and 27.7, Lambert concludes that the priest was "personally supplying the victims for sacrifices," but the relevant phrase (παραστήσας . . . θύματα) is almost wholly restored, on the uncertainties of which see above, p. 92. Naiden (2013.216) offers in support of his claim that "Athens . . . reduced the cost of sacrifice by inducing priests . . . to spend their own money on victims and other expenses" only *IG* II^2 776 and *SEG* 42.116 and 29.135, of which 42.116 is a deme decree and 29.135 a *genos* decree, each a quite different case from polis expectations. That priests and priestesses did not contribute victims for polis sacrifices contradicts my earlier thoughts as expressed in, e.g., 1998.294.

13 *SEG* 32.218.

Epimeletai, choregoi, and agonothetai were appointed by or elected by the polis to supervise and participate in a number of religious activities. In earlier times, ten epimeletai for the City Dionysia were elected, and they paid at their own expense for the cost of the *pompe*. By the time of the *Ath. Pol.*, ten were chosen by lot, one from each tribe, and the polis gave to them 10,000 drachmas to cover the costs of the *pompe*.[14] In 186/5 twenty-four epimeletai of the City Dionysia are honored for having "sent" the *pompe* and for having performed their other duties, and there is no explicit mention of a financial contribution.[15] Among the other polis cults that had epimeletai, only the epimeletai of the Mysteries appear to have contributed their own funds.[16] The most generous of these was Xenocles who had built, spending his own money, a stone bridge so that τὰ ἱερά might travel "safely and καλῶ[ς]," as well as the participants in the *panegyris*, and so that the residents and farmers might also be safe.[17] In 267/6 the epimeletai of the Mysteries sacrificed "from their own funds" τὰ σωτήρια to Demeter and Kore on behalf of the Boule and Demos.[18] The epimeletai of the Mysteries in 214/3 prepared a team of oxen for transporting τὰ ἱερά,[19] sent for the Eleusinia a bull as a victim, and, more generally, spent "from their own funds" for all the other things that were appropriate for the sacrifices.[20]

In the mid-fourth century there were at least forty-five choregoi, and before the reforms, probably under Demetrius of Phaleron, when choregoi were replaced by the single, elected agonothetes for each year, the choregoi paid from their own funds the expenses for a variety of choruses in Athenian *heortai*.[21] Therefore honors to a choregos always assumed, without expressing it, that the choregos had spent his own money. And for polis *heortai* the expenditures might be significant. In Lysias 21.1–5 we have a young man who as choregos, in different terms of office, in 411/0 spent 3,000 drachmas for

14 *Ath. Pol.* 56.4, on which see Rhodes, 1993.627–8.

15 *IG* II^3 1284.29–56.

16 On their contributions, see Hakkarainen, 1997.23–4.

17 *I. Eleusis* 95.15–23 of ca. 321/0 (?). On Xenocles and his bridge, and on an epigram (*AP* 9.147) written about it, and on the two statues that Xenocles dedicated at Eleusis (*I. Eleusis* 97 and 98), see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.105–7 and Mikalson, 1998.35–6. For a similar bridge, built by the polis in 422/1 for much the same purposes, see *I. Eleusis* 41.

18 *I. Eleusis* 181.22–4.

19 Cf. *IG* II^3 1188.7–8.

20 *IG* II^3 1164.18–20, 24–5, 30–2. On these activities and others of these epimeletai, see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.261–5.

21 On all matters concerning the *choregia*, see now Wilson, 2000. For a recent and hypothetical reconstruction of how and when the transformation from the *choregia* to the *agonothesia* occurred, see Csapo and Wilson, 2010.

a tragic chorus in the City Dionysia and 2,000 drachmas for a men's chorus at the Thargelia, in 410/9 5,000 for a dithyrambic chorus and victory monument, in 403 more than 1,500 for a boy's chorus, and, lastly, 1,600 for a comic chorus in 402.[22] Choregoi were not to reappear until the Roman period.

After the replacement of polis choregoi during the reign of Demetrius of Phaleron by a single, elected agonothetes for each year, some agonothetai contributed significant amounts of their own money for the several *heortai* and attendant *agones* under their supervision.[23] Philippides, the wealthy comic poet, is the earliest (284/3) attested to have done so. During his term he spent "as a volunteer from his own funds," sacrificed the ancestral sacrifices to the gods, gave to all Athenians all their *agones*, and introduced a new *agon* for Demeter and Kore. He supervised also the other sacrifices and *agones* on behalf of the city, and for all of these he spent from his own funds.[24] The costs of the *agonothesia* might be enormous. The prominent politician Euryclides who had served as agonothetes in the last third of III BC spent 63,000 drachmas and then more when, apparently, his son was agonothetes.[25] How so much money could have been spent in one year is suggested by *IG* II^2 968.40–55, which honors Miltiades of Marathon for, among other things, his *agonothesia* of just one *heorte*, the Panathenaia. As agonothetes of the Panathenaia shortly after 144/3 Miltiades faced a daunting task, not only to produce the *heorte* but to restore its finances and equipment and to repair various buildings. He gave an interest-free loan and contributed "not a little" of his own money to deal with the financial crisis. He repaired "the things needing work" on the Acropolis and in the Odeion. He gave ropes for the Panathenaic ship-cart and what else was lacking for the transport of the *peplos*. He did "in a grand manner (μεγαλομερῶς) all the things for the *pompe* and sacrifices owed to the gods," and

22 On this "anonymous, extremely wealthy young leitourgical extrovert" and the political circumstances in which he made these and similar contributions, see Wilson, 2000.89–92. *SEG* 45.101 of 293/2 reflects the change from choregoi to a single agonothetes. Philippides is honored for his liturgies over a long period, earlier, as his father had been, for his *choregia*, later for serving as an agonothetes. On this text see Wilson, 2000. 274. For Demosthenes' unsuccessful *choregia* at the Dionysia of 348, see Dem. 21, esp. 67, 69, and 159 and MacDowell, 1990, esp. 7–9.

23 On the post-Demetrian agonothetai, see Wilson, 2000. 270–6, Mikalson, 1998.35, 55–8, 118–19, 252, 279–80, and 298–9, and Hakkarainen, 1997.22–3.

24 *IG* II^2 657.38–47. On this text and Philippides see Wilson, 2000.275, Mikalson, 1998.57, 99–100, and 106, and Hakkarainen, 1997.22. Cf. *SEG* 39.125.

25 *IG* II^3 1160. 4–7. On this text see Mikalson, 1998.57.

he put on the *agones* in a manner worthy of his office and of the Demos that had elected him. And, he paid for it all himself.[26]

The same Miltiades had served as agonothetes for the Theseia in 153/2, and four documents from mid-II BC record the contributions of such individuals who supervised apparently only the Theseia.[27] In 161/0 Nicogenes sent the *pompe*, held the sacrifice for Theseus, and supervised the torch race and athletic *agon*, and provided the prizes for individuals and tribes. He also gave to the Boule 1200 drachmas as their daily pay and 100 drachmas to the prytaneis for a sacrifice.[28] For these and the *stele* he erected listing the winners, he spent of his own funds over 2690 drachmas.[29] The agonothetes of the Theseia in 157/6 did much the same thing,[30] and in 153/2 Miltiades for the same activities spent over 3390 drachmas. Both he and Nicogenes are to be remembered among those who "gave readily" (ἑτοιμῶς διδόντων), and each is crowned "because of the εὔνοια and φιλοτιμία which he continuously has concerning the Boule and the Demos of Athenians."[31] In the years 99/8 and 98/7 two wealthy men as agonothetai contributed 1500 drachmas, not to the *heortai* they served but as subscribers to the *aparchai* for the Pythaïs to Delphi.[32]

For a brief period at the end of the second century the kosmetai of ephebes contributed for sacrifices involving the ephebes. Both Eudoxus in 107/6 and Timon in 102/1 "from their own funds" paid for the εἰσιτητήρια sacrifices in the Prytaneion. Eudoxus also paid for repairs to the Diogeneion.[33] Demetrius, the kosmetes of 117/6, was the most generous. He paid for *all* the sacrifices to the gods and benefactors of the Demos. He also, quite unusually, rejected the gold crown awarded him, preferring εὐφημία among the citizens to his

---

26 Mikalson, 1998.258. It is worth noting that the 100 victims alone of the quadrennial Panathenaia in 410/9 cost 5114 drachmas (*IG* II^3 375.7). On Miltiades and the Panathenaia, see Shear, 2001.620–21.

27 For a similar document of 109/8, see *SEG* 40.121. On the Theseia and these texts, see Deshours, 2011.113–23, Mikalson, 1998.252–3, and Bugh, 1990.

28 The 1200 drachmas to the bouleutai were perhaps recompense for two days of not attending the Boule and hence not receiving their usual pay. The agonothetes of 157/6 gave only 600 drachmas for this purpose, perhaps covering the lost pay of only one day (*IG* II^2 957.10).

29 *IG* II^2 956.2–19.

30 *IG* II^2 957.1–14.

31 εὐνοίας ἕν[εκε]ν καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἣν ἔχων διατελεῖ περί τε τὴμ [β]ουλὴν καὶ [τὸν] δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, *IG* II^2 958. On Miltiades and this text, see Mikalson, 1998.258.

32 Medeios as agonothetes of both the Panathenaia and Delia, Sarapion as agonothetes of the Panathenaia, Delia, Eleusinia, and Diasia. *SEG* 32.218.182–7, 208–13.

33 Eudoxus, *IG* II^2 1011.34–5, 41; Timon, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.95–9.

personal profit.[34] The kosmetai, apparently, were the only ephebic officials to contribute money to the ephebes' religious program, and only for a few years.[35]

Late in our period, 103/2–97/6, several strategoi, like the archons, contributed for the *theoria* to Delphi,[36] but, apart from them, only strategoi commanding garrisoned troops on the Athenian borders in the later parts of the third century are attested to have contributed money to religious activities. The strategos, his troops, and the local community formed essentially an ad hoc religious community, and in this unusual situation some of the strategoi took on religious responsibilities.[37] At Rhamnous one strategos in 269/8 repaired the sanctuary of Nemesis, so that "it might be in honor καλῶς and εὐσεβῶς for the demesmen.[38] Another, in 235/4, from his own funds gave victims for the sacrifice of the Nemesia and of the King, again so that things concerning the goddesses might be καλῶς for the demesmen.[39] A third, in 211/0, sacrificed to Themis, Nemesis, and the other gods and sacrificed the *exiteteria* (ἐξιτητήρια)

34 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.10–11, 60–1, 65–9.

35 On these texts see Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.257–8. He would have the ephebes themselves paying for the costs of their sacrificial victims, not exceptionally but *de règle*, and is followed in this by Lambert (2012.82) and Deshours (2011.174, 177, and 310). Perrin-Saminadayar reaches this conclusion by taking expressions such as ἐλειτούργησαν δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις ἁπάσαις as "*accompli à leurs frais tous les sacrifices*," which, as discussed above (p. 23), can equally well or better be translated as "and they served also in all the sacrifices," without the implication of financial contribution. The critical text here is *SEG* 15.104.19–20 of 127/6, and the critical lines read, ἐλειτούργησαν δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις ἁπάσαις εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως οὐθὲν ἐνλείποντες τῶν ἀναγκαίων, with, Lambert (82) claims, "the clear implication being that they had funded the sacrifices." Two points: nothing in the text indicates that the ephebes paid their own money, because ἐλειτούργησαν in this context probably reflects "services," not financial contributions. Secondly, this text is idiosyncratic among ephebic related texts. It concerns, unlike the usual ephebic texts, the public subscription to raise funds for the Pythaïs, and if one still wishes to see a financial contribution in lines 19–20, that would be the context. The long series of other ephebic texts make no explicit mention of the ephebes contributing their own money for their sacrifices, and the kosmetai contributed for sacrifices in only two years. The only evidence pointing to the ephebes' financial contribution is the isolated phrase ταῦρον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων in *IG* II^2 1030.14, a decree honoring them in ca. 98/7. What is perhaps of more significance is the lack of the phrase ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων in the many other accounts of the ephebes' own religious activities.

36 *SEG* 32.218.

37 On these religious communities, see Mikalson 1998.155–60.

38 *I. Rhamnous* II.3.15–17.

39 *I. Rhamnous* II.17.27–30. Habicht (2006.157) translates the final phrase as "damit die Rhamnusier hinsichtlich der Göttinen das Rechte tun."

to Aphrodite Hegemone, all from his own funds.[40] The strategos commanding the garrison at Eleusis in this same period invited all the citizens to sacrifices to Demeter and Kore at the Haloa, "thinking they ought to share in the 'good things' that happened in the sacrifices." And for this he spent his own money.[41] Each strategos apparently could choose his own form of contribution. Our last two certainly did. Theomnestus, strategos at Sunium in 219/8, built there a temple and sanctuary of Asclepius, quite likely at his own expense,[42] and, most interestingly, the strategos Apollodorus at Rhamnous in late III BC gave instead of selling a plot of his land to devotees of Sarapis among his troops so they could build a sanctuary.[43] In addition to the strategoi of the garrisoned troops, one trierarch, presumably just for the crew of his own ship, sacrificed at his own expense in 224/3 to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira "for the health and safety and harmony of his fellow sailors." For another sacrifice, to Nemesis, he contributed the victims and the wine.[44] These military officers contributed their own money, but, again, in a special situation and time, and no other strategoi are recorded to have made such contributions of their own funds.

In a different context the taxiarchs as a group are twice, in 275/4 and 271/0, honored by the polis for having made all the necessary sacrifices with the strategoi "from their own funds."[45]

Lycurgus invited a number of individuals to support the polis religious program after 336/5, including Deinias who donated land so that the remodeling of the Panathenaic stadium could be completed; Eudemus, a Plataean, who supplied 1000 teams of oxen for the same project in 330/29; and Neoptolemus who gilded an altar of Apollo in the Agora. Lycurgus also raised 650 talents on loan from private individuals, some of which he may have used for the cult of Athena Polias, including golden statues of Nike, gold and silver processional vessels, and gold jewelry for the one hundred kanephoroi.[46] In 270/69 Callias of Sphettos was honored by the polis for many services, including that he had served as the archetheoros of the *theoria* to the first Ptolemaia in Egypt,

---

40 *I. Rhamnous* II.32.10–13. On the *exiteteria*, offerings made on leaving office, and on Aphrodite Hegemone, see Bevilacqua, 1996.

41 *I. Eleusis* 196.9–13 of ca. 234.

42 *IG* II^2 1302. On this see Goette, 2000.53.

43 *I. Rhamnous* II.59.11–19. On Sarapis in Athens, see Mikalson, 1998.180–1 and 275–7.

44 *I. Rhamnous* II.31.9–13 and 16–19.

45 *Agora* 16.185 8–10 and 187.9–13.

46 Deinias, [Plut.] *X. Orat.* 841d; Eudemus, *IG* II^3 352; and Neoptolemus, *X. Orat.* 843f. See Mikalson, 1998.27–28.

probably in 283/2, and in that role he himself had paid the 5,000 drachmas the polis had allocated to him for this purpose.[47] Sosandrus of Sypalettus, at the end of II BC, contributed to the "adornment of the sanctuaries," including probably the repair of the temple of Athena.[48] From our period a tamias of the prytaneis once, in mid-III BC, not only allocated money for sacrifices to the hieropoioi but also himself sacrificed "from his own funds."[49]

In 328/7 the Boule made a dedication to Amphiaraus of Oropus, but, oddly, only twenty-one members of the Boule and thirteen others privately contributed money for the dedication.[50] By the last quarter of IV BC the sanctuary of Amphiaraus at Rhamnous was in bad repair. The "house" had lost its door and roof tiles were broken, part of the wall had collapsed, the god's table was broken, and the stoa was in danger of collapse. Twenty-three Athenians, styling themselves Amphieraestae, contributed money for repairs and sacrifices.[51] Both of these, of the bouleutai and of the Amphieraestae, can be labeled "subscriptions" in which a number of individuals participated. They might be termed "private subscriptions" to benefit polis cults. "Public subscriptions," that is subscriptions originating from the polis itself, are rarely attested for religious purposes.[52] Three possible, but not certain, examples are for a sacrifice in IV BC, for the repair of an unknown sanctuary in late IV or early III BC, and for the repair of the Theater of Dionysus in Piraeus in mid-II BC.[53] The certain examples are the Pythaïdes, the *theoriai* to Delphi from 138/7 to 98/7, new and special events. State-originated subscriptions were clearly not a significant factor in the financing of polis cults.

---

47 On the Ptolemaia in Alexandria, see Rutherford, 2013.44, 255–8, and 267–8.

48 Callias, *SEG* 28.60.55–62 and Sosandrus, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #16.

49 *Agora* 15.85.13–15. Hakkarainen (1997.23) suggests that the sacrifices by the prytany became a *liturgy* of the prytany and its officials, and that they would contribute towards their costs. There is no evidence for this except this text.

50 *I. Oropos* 299. On this text see Lambert, 2012a.26–30 and 53.

51 *I. Rhamnous* II.167. On these Amphieraestae, see Mikalson, 1998.102 and 150.

52 Migeotte (1992.9–46) has gathered all twenty of the attested Athenian public subscriptions (ἐπιδόσεις), i.e., voluntary contributions solicited by the state. Thirteen of these concern military matters. Similar subscriptions for the construction or repair of sanctuaries and for cultic events are occasionally attested for other cities in the period (Migeotte, 329–32 and 343–5). On such *epidoseis*, see also Hakkarainen, 1997.12–13.

53 Sacrifice, Plut. *Phoc.* 9.1–2 = Migeotte #3; sanctuary, *IG* II^2 2330 = Migeotte #13; Piraeus theater, *IG* II^2 2334 = Migeotte #20.

Deme Cults

"The costs of cult—upkeep of temples and shrines, offering of regular sacrifices, celebration of recurrent festivals—surely represented, for any deme, the major object of regular expenditure." So David Whitehead introduces a detailed study (1986.163–175) of how the demes financed their cults. They did so in various ways, through rents from deme or sacred properties, through lending capital of the deme or of cults, through taxes, and, of particular interest here, some through organized contributions by individuals.

Two deme sacred calendars, that of the Marathon Tetrapolis (*SEG* 50.168) and that of Erchia (*SEG* 21.541), establish that, for these five demes at least, individuals in the period 375–350 (?) were paying the costs of the demes' sacrificial program. For the four demes of the Tetrapolis approximately 400 individuals, roughly one-third of all the members, contributed amounts of 20–100 drachmas, perhaps as one-time donations to establish an endowment.[54] The Erchians, apparently, took a different approach, with the deme's annual sacrifices divided into five groups, with one individual responsible each year for the cost of one of the groups, amounting to ca. 110 drachmas. The sacrificial calendars from the other demes do not give evidence of other such individual contributions, but it is noteworthy that, from the deme Erikeia, *IG* II^2 1215 of early III BC seems to describe, in usual diction and grammar, a somewhat similar situation in which elected deme officials, not necessarily religious officials, were expected to contribute money for the establishment and construction of sanctuaries and for the erection of dedications "for their own health and the safety of the Demos."[55]

Choregoi financed costs of the *agones* of Dionysia in the demes, and so, for example, the demesmen of Aixone in IV BC praised their choregoi Democrates and Hegesias or Leontios and Glaucon.[56] In the early second century BC, the demesmen of Melite praise their priestess of the Thesmophoroi for spending

54 For this and all matters concerning this sacred calendar, see Lambert, 2000a.

55 ὑπερ ὑγιείας αὐτῶ[ν καὶ τῆς τοῦ δήμου] σωτηρ[ίας]. On this problematical text see Lasagni, 2004.119–20 and Whitehead, 1986.112, 171–2, and 379–80.

56 Schwenk #66 of 326/5 and *IG* II^2 1200 of 317/6. In the mid-fourth century Damasias the Theban provided two choruses for the Dionysia at Eleusis but is not termed a choregos. That may be why it is stated that he prepared the choruses at his own expense (*I. Eleusis* 70.7–15). Whitehead, 1986.151 terms these "unofficial *chorêgiai*." On foreigners serving as choregoi, see Mikalson, 1998.59 n. 44.

over 100 drachmas "from her own funds," probably for the annual sacrifices of the cult.[57]

Only two demarchs, both of Eleusis, made contributions. Euthydemus sacrificed to Dionysus "for the health and safety of the demesmen" "from himself," at the end of IV BC. And Pamphilus in 165/4 had sacrificed at the Haloa and Chloia and to Demeter and Kore and the other gods, and he had held the sacrifice and *pompe* of the Kalamaia, and "for all these things he spent not a little 'from his own money.' "[58]

In the mid-fourth century Damias, a Theban, used his own funds to provide two choruses for the Eleusinian Dionysia as a contribution to Demeter, Kore, and Dionysus.[59] Salamis was not a deme, but for local cults probably functioned much as one,[60] and the gymnasiarch of the residents of Salamis was honored in 131/0 for having put on the local Hermaia, having spent "not a little," and for spending from his own funds more money for the olive oil than was allotted to him.[61] The Salaminians in 116/5 also honored three individuals who contributed to the adornment and repair of local sanctuaries.[62]

Private Cults

The picture of contributions by officials in private cults is, not surprisingly, quite different. In 272/1 Agathon and his wife Zeuxion, as priestess, served the cult of the Mother of the Gods in Piraeus. They supervised (ἐπεμελήθησαν) the priesthood and the sanctuary, and they also supervised the orgeones, from their own expenditures.[63] In III BC Bacchis, the epimeletria of the *thiasos* of Agathe Thea spent, apparently for her supervision of the sanctuary, of a throne and a table, and for setting up the torch at all the meetings, from her own funds more than twice the amount allocated to her for these purposes.[64]

---

57 *Agora* 16.277.6–7. It has been claimed that this is the last surviving deme inscription (see commentary in *Agora* 16), and that the priestess had to pay for these sacrifices may suggest the desperate straits of the demes in this period. On that, see Mikalson, 1998.190–3. Another very fragmentary text may have a contribution by a priestess of Nymphe for purposes that cannot be clearly determined. She is honored by a *genos* (*SEG* 29.135.2–5).

58 *I. Eleusis* 101.8–10 and 229.7–11.

59 *I. Eleusis* 70.7–15. On this text see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.87–9.

60 Taylor, 1997.183–8.

61 *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #1.7–10.

62 *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #2.

63 *IG* II^2 1316.II.6–10.

64 *SEG* 56.203.6–10.

In the cult of an unknown goddess, in 278/7, three epimeletai and a grammateus gave 65 (?) drachmas, apparently for sacrifices, "adornment" of the goddess, and the construction of a new altar.[65] In early II BC the citizen orgeones of Bendis honored their epimeletes who spent "from his own funds" for the repair of the sanctuary and the goddess' *pompe*,[66] and in 138/7 the orgeones of Aphrodite honored their epimeletes who "served" (ἐθεράπευσεν) their gods "from his own funds."[67] The only hieropoioi attested to have contributed their own money for (unknown) cult purposes belonged to private associations, a *koinon* of eranistai and the technitai of Dionysus.[68]

Tamiai of private cults are also attested to have spent their own money for their cults. The thiasotai of the cult of Zeus Labraundos, all foreigners, in 299/8 honored their tamias who, by spending his own money, apparently for new construction in the sanctuary, "made clear the εὔνοια which he has towards the thiasotai."[69] The tamias of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods in 178/7 spent his money for a number of cult purposes, including sacrifices and repairs to the sanctuary.[70] Most interesting is Dionysius of Marathon who served not only as tamias of a *koinon* of fifteen prominent Dionysiastae in Piraeus but was founder or co-founder of the association. After his death he was honored in 176/5 for his many contributions, including, as tamias, building the temple, contributing 1,000 drachmas to endow the association's monthly sacrifices, giving another 500 drachmas for the cult statue, and providing various gold and silver cultic implements and dedications.[71]

It is fitting to close this section with the cult of Asclepius on the south slope of the Acropolis and its founder Telemachus, himself possibly an Epidaurian. *SEG* 25.226 looks to be his own record of his contributions to the introduction

---

65 *IG* II^2 1277.7–12. The grammateus of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods also, at the minimum, loaned the cult money without interest when the tamias was absent (*IG* II^2 1329 of 175/4).

66 *IG* II^2 1324.1–7.

67 *MDAI* 66.228.4.7–8. On this cult see Mikalson, 1998.278.

68 Eranistai, *IG* II^2 1265 of ca. 300; technitai, *IG* II^2 1320 of late III BC. On the technitai see Aneziri, 2003 and Mikalson, 1998.117–22, 262–72, and 280–2.

69 *IG* II^2 1271.10–13.

70 *IG* II^2 1327. On this cult see Mikalson, 1998.142–3, 148, and 202–4.

71 *IG* II^2 1326. Cf. 1325 of 185/4. On Dionysius and these Dionysiastae, see Mikalson, 1998. 204–6. On the "heroization" of the founder and other such heroizations in this period, see Hughes, 1999, esp. p. 169. In 236/5 the archeranistes of a *thiasos* contributed a *stele*, perhaps this one upon which were engraved the names of the 38 male and 21 female members (*IG* II^2 1297). On this *koinon*, see Mikalson, 1998.148–9.

of this cult, from 420/19 to at least 412/1.[72] These included, in addition to arranging the introduction of the cult from Piraeus, building an altar and some other buildings, the surrounding wall and gates, plantings and "adornment" of the whole sanctuary. Probably all of these and the last two explicitly were done at his own expense (lines 39–42). This sanctuary was privately founded, but surely with approval of the polis, and did not become a polis cult until, probably, mid-IV BC. After that we have, of course, many private dedications but no private contributions for the construction or upkeep of the sanctuary.

Summary, by Date, of Contributors of Own Funds

Polis Cults

until late IV BC	choregoi, and then some agonothetai
IV BC	private citizens, subscription for a sacrifice
338	private citizen, under Lycurgan initiative, oxen for construction
328/7	Some bouleutai and others, for the Boule's dedication to Amphiaraus
330/29	private citizen, under Lycurgan initiative, gilding altar
last quarter of IV BC	Amphieraestae, sacrifice and repair of Amphiaraus sanctuary in Rhamnous
321/0	epimeletes of Mysteries, construction of bridge
before late IV BC and not thereafter	epimeletai of City Dionysia, for the *pompe*
late IV BC or early III BC	private citizens, subscription for repair of sanctuary
284/3	agonothetes, various things including sacrifice
275/4	taxiarchs, sacrifice
271/0	taxiarchs, sacrifice
270/69	Callias, costs of *theoria*
269/8	strategos at Rhamnous, repair of Nemesis sanctuary
267/6	epimeletai of Mysteries, sacrifice
mid-III BC	tamias of prytaneis, sacrifice

72 On the introduction of Asclepius to Athens and this monument, see Anderson, 2015. 313–15, Wickkiser, 2008, Parker, 1996.175–85, and Clinton, 1994.

237/6	priestess of Athena Polias, for a sacrifice
235/4	strategos at Rhamnous, sacrificial victims
before 234	strategos at Eleusis, sacrifice to Demeter and Kore
last third of III BC	agonothetes, various things
224/3	trierarch at Rhamnous, sacrifice to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira
225–220	epimeletai of Mysteries, team of oxen
219/8	strategos at Sunium, building temple and sanctuary
214/3	epimeletai of Mysteries, repair bridge, sent victim, and others
211/0	strategos at Rhamnous, sacrifice
161/0	agonothetes of Theseia, sacrifice and other things
mid-II BC	subscription for repair of Theater of Dionysus in Piraeus
157/6	agonothetes of Theseia, sacrifice and other things
153/2	agonothetes of Theseia, sacrifice and other things
after 143	agonothetes, Panathenaia, numerous things
117/6	kosmetes of ephebes, sacrifices
107/6	kosmetes of ephebes, sacrifices and other things
103/2–97/6	numerous priests, officials, and individuals, subscription for *aparchai* for Pythaïdes
102/1	kosmetes of ephebes, sacrifices
end of II BC	private individual, adornment of sanctuaries

Deme Cults

until late IV BC (?)	choregoi
mid-IV BC	Theban, choruses for Eleusinian Dionysia
375–350 (?)	private citizens, for sacrificial program of Marathonian tetrapolis
375–350 (?)	private citizens, for sacrificial program of Erchia
end of IV BC	demarch of Eleusis, sacrifice to Dionysus
early III BC	elected deme officials of Erikeia, for construction of sanctuaries and dedications
early II BC	priestess of Thesmophoroi at Melite, sacrifice (?)
165/4	demarch of Eleusis, sacrifice and *pompe*
131/0	gymnasiarch of Salamis, for putting on Hermaia
116/5	private citizens, adorning and repairing sanctuaries on Salamis

Private Cults

420/19 until at least 412/1	founding of, buildings, and adornments for cult of Asclepius on south slope of Acropolis, by Telemachus
ca. 300	hieropoios, *koinon* of eranistai, purpose unknown
III BC	epimeletria, thiasotai of Agathe Thea, various things
299/8	tamias, thiasotai of Zeus Labraundos, new construction
278/7	epimeletes and grammateus, of unknown goddess, sacrifice and other things
272/1	priestess and epimeletes (?), orgeones of Mother of the Gods, various things
late III BC	hieropoioi, technitai of Dionysus, unknown things
late III BC	strategos at Rhamnous, land for sanctuary for Sarapiastae
early II BC	epimeletes, orgeones of Bendis, *pompe*, repair of sanctuary
185/4	tamias and founder, Dionysiastae in Piraeus, various things, including endowment of sacrifices
178/7	tamias, orgeones of Mother of the Gods, sacrifices and repairs to sanctuary
138/7	epimeletes, orgeones of Aphrodite, service to gods

We discuss such contributions in the context of the authority of the polis in Chapter 12, but note here a few salient points. There are remarkably few attested contributions by priests, priestesses, government, and military officials towards the expenses of polis cults, especially towards those expenses concerning sacrifices. In the demes, and for certain in the Marathonian Tetrapolis and Erchia, individuals did contribute money for the deme's sacrificial program, and we see for polis cult none of the type of evidence that proves this for the demes.[73] Also, the number of polis texts significantly outweighs that of deme cults, and so, proportionately, we have many more contributions by deme officials than by polis officials. In private cults, naturally, priests, priestesses and other individuals contributed significantly to the welfare of their cult, again if one weighs the number of texts from private cults against the number from polis cults. What we seem to have is, essentially, three different structures for

73 For the thought that "as small communities, demes were, or sooner became, more dependent on the benefactions of individuals than larger ones such as the polis," see Lambert, 2011.208. n. 10. Cf. R&O, p. 233.

the funding of the three different types of cult. The polis paid for the polis sacrifices[74] and had systems to fund some *agones* through individuals; the demes had their own programs to fund cultic activity centrally, but in addition some had systems to collect individual contributions for their sacrificial programs; and private cults depended on ad hoc contributions or dues from members. It is in these contexts that individuals made, or did not make, financial contributions for religious purposes.

74 The record of which was the Solonian / Nicomachean Sacred Calendar, *SEG* 52.48.

PART 2

Authority

∵

Introduction to Part 2

In terms of "authority" in Greek or Athenian religion we can concentrate on what authority various officials such as priests, government officials like the archon or basileus, lay boards such as the hieropoioi and epimeletai, and various others exercised, or what authority the Ekklesia had vs. the Boule, the polis vs. the deme, the polis vs. the priests, and other such pairs. Useful evidence for this has been collected in Part 1, and we will draw some conclusions on these topics from that in Part 3, Acclamation and Authority. Here we focus on what emerge as the four major determinants of religious actions, what authorities the Athenians claim when they are sacrificing or performing other religious actions or are praising others for their religious actions. These are τὰ πάτρια (Chapter 6), *nomoi* and *psephismata*, together and separately (Chapter 7), and oracles (Chapter 8).[1]

As an initial example we offer *IG* II^2 776.10–14 in which, in 237/6, the priestess of Athena Polias was praised because she supervised [καλ]ῶς καὶ φιλοτίμ[ως] the adornment of the table for the goddess κατὰ τὰ [πάτρια], and because she supervised the other things which the *nomoi* and the *psephismata* of the Demos (οἵ τ[ε νόμοι καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τοῦ δήμο]υ) were assigning ([προσ]έταττον) her.[2] We have here a distinction between κατὰ τὰ πάτρια and what the *nomoi* and the *psephismata* assign. In this section we investigate first which religious matters are determined by τὰ πάτρια, which by *nomoi* and *psephismata* together, which by *nomoi* and *psephismata* separately, and which by oracles. We seek first to determine if these authorities were used with careful distinction and consistently, as this text initially suggests, and then in Chapter 9 to investigate the relationships among them.

1 I do not treat the "authorities" from which, apparently, Solon derived at least part of his calendar and which survive on the calendar published by Nicomachus. These included records of sacrifices from lists entitled "from the Tribe-Kings," "from those <arranged> month by month," "from those on no fixed day," and "from the *stelai*" or "from the draft proposals." On these see Parker, 1996.45–8.

2 *IG* II^2 776.10–14.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_008

CHAPTER 6

Τὰ Πάτρια

πάτριοι θυσίαι ("ancestral sacrifices")

A few polis sacrifices (θυσίαι) are explicitly termed πάτριοι.[1] The basileus, as we have seen, "administered" (διοικεῖ) the πάτριοι θυσίαι.[2] The Praxiergidae, with a subvention of 100 drachmas from the priestess of Athena Polias, sacrificed a θυσία πάτριος, most probably at the Plynteria.[3] The agonothetai of 284/3 and of 252/1 were each praised for making the πάτριοι θυσίαι, but the recipients are not specified.[4] And [Dem.] *Epist.* 3.31 would have Athenian πάτριοι θυσίαι made at Delphi. The context of Thucydides' (3.58.5) mention of θυσίαι πάτριοι suggests that here they are the θυσίαι established as part of the new Eleutheria in 479 at Plataea to celebrate the Greek victory over the Persians.[5] If so, they would be Panhellenic and their designation as πάτριοι in Thucydides would come only about fifty years after they were established.

Making the πάτριοι θυσίαι is a component of the restoration and enhancement of the cult of Apollo in 129/8, and here not only will τὰ πάτρια be observed but also new, additional θύσιαι and τιμαί are decreed, and it looks as though these new sacrifices are designated as τὰ προεψηφισμένα ("the ones voted before," that is, "the ones previously approved by *nomoi* or *psephismata*") in distinction from the πάτριοι θυσίαι.[6]

It appears from Lysias 26.6–8 that the sacrifices by the nine archons at the end of their term each year on behalf of their successors were also πάτρια, though not expressly termed πάτριοι θυσίαι. We note also αἱ πάτριοι εὐχαί made by the keryx at the opening of meetings of the Ekklesia (Aeschines 1.23).[7]

1 See in the orators, e.g., Lysias, 30.19–20, Isoc.7.29, and Din. 1.110. In Lysias 30.21 we have a variant expression (ἅπαντα τὰ πάτρια θύεται) for πάτριοι θυσίαι. In none of these is the recipient given.

2 *Ath. Pol.* 57.1.

3 *IG* II^2 776.18–20 of 237/6. See Parker, 1996.307–308.

4 *IG* II^2 657.38–41 and 780.14–15. The *agon* of the Haloa was also termed πάτριος in *I. Eleusis* 184.14–15 of 259/8.

5 On the Eleutheria at Plataea, see Mikalson, 2003.99–101.

6 *SEG* 21.469C.12–13, 17–19, 24. ἐπὶ τοῖς προεψηφισμένοις is translated as "en plus des (sacrifices) déjà décidés . . . par décret" by Deshours, 2011.107.

7 Cf. [Lysias] 6.4, of prayers by the basileus.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_009

κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ("according to ancestral customs")

What is the noun assumed in the phrase τὰ πάτρια in a religious context? It is rarely given, but from the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (2.3), attributed to Anaximenes, it would seem to be ἔθη, "customs" or "habits."[8] κατὰ τὰ πάτρια occurs first in Aristophanes (*Acharnians* 1000, of 425) in reference to the Choes. Next we find it in Thucydides 5.18.2, in his citation of the fifty-year treaty between Athens and Sparta in 422/1, allowing whoever wished access to sacrifice at, to go to, view, and ask for oracles κατὰ τὰ πάτρια at the "common sanctuaries" (τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν κοινῶν).[9] Here it refers to Panhellenic, not specifically Athenian πάτρια.

The speaker of Lysias 30.19 links explicitly to εὐσέβεια his demand "to sacrifice κατὰ τὰ πάτρια." The agonothetes of 282/1 was praised for supervising (ἐπεμελήθη) that all the sacrifices were performed κατὰ τὰ πάτρια,[10] and here there may be a distinction from the simple performing of πάτριοι θυσίαι. The emphasis may be on "following ancestral customs" in the oversight of the sacrifices, probably not in regard to the details of ritual—which are never specified in these texts—but in respect to the deities and the times of sacrifice, both of which could be determined by τὰ πάτρια. These sacrifices no doubt can be considered πάτριοι, and so we will consider them, but here "ancestral customs" may involve not just the fact of the sacrifice but also the appropriate deity and occasion. So, too, for the agonothetai of the Theseia of 161/0, 157/6, and 153/2 who joined in the performance (συνετέλεσεν) of the sacrifice to Theseus κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[11] Here their role in the sacrifice was apparently determined by τὰ πάτρια. Likewise the epimeletai of the Mysteries are, along with the basileus, Eumolpidae, and Kerykes, to administer the Mysteries κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[12] The demarch of Eleusis, with the hierophant and the priestesses, joined in the performance (συνετέλεσεν) of the sacrifice and *pompe* of the Kalamaia κατὰ

8 Cf. *SEG* 21.469C.3 and Lycurg. *Leoc.* 25. In a non-religious context, see Andoc. 1.83 and [Arist.] *VV* 1250b17 and 1251a38–9. τὰ πάτρια ἱερά, by contrast, should usually be taken as "the ancestral sacred 'things,'" referring not only to "sacrifices" and "rites" as it is usually taken, but to all "sacred matters," as in Aeschin. 1.23 and [Dem.] 59. Fisher (2001.147) on Aeschin. 1.23 has this right: "ancestral religious matters."

9 Hornblower, 1991–2008, *ad loc.*, notes that "it is odd to find [καὶ ἰέναι] in the second place after the infinitive verb 'to sacrifice' which logically presupposes the travel in question." He then records various attempts at emendation. The reason, quite probably, is that "to sacrifice" is in religious terms the most important of the various elements and thus is given first position.

10 *IG* II^2 682.53–5.

11 *IG* II^2 956.5–6, 957.3–4, and 958.4–5.

12 *I. Eleusis* 138.A29–30 of mid-IV BC. Cf. *Ath. Pol.* 39.2 and 57.1.

τὰ πάτρια.[13] And the demesmen of Halai Aixonides praised their priest of Apollo Zoster because he supervised (ἐπεμελήθη) their sacrifice κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[14] But one could also simply sacrifice κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. The members of the tribe Erechtheis in the first half of the fourth century bid their priest to sacrifice to Erechtheus and Poseidon [κατὰ τὰ] πάτρια.[15] The archon of the Mesogeioi sacrificed "to the gods and heroes καλῶς καὶ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια."[16] Uniquely in the many ephebic texts, the kosmetes of 122/1 sacrificed with the ephebes in their ἐγγραφαί "on the common hearth" κατὰ τὰ πάτ[ρια].[17] Philippides is honored in a decree of 293/2 for having sacrificed, as basileus, the sacrifices that fell to him εὐσ[ε]βῶς καὶ κα[τ]ὰ τὰ π[άτ]ρια.[18] And Euthius, the archon of 283/2, is said to have "sacrificed the sacrifices to the gods κατὰ τὰ πάτρια."[19] That the basileus sacrificed κατὰ τὰ πάτρια is appropriate, because in the *Athenaion Politeia* (3.3 and 57.1) he is assigned the τὰ πάτρια,[20] but it is surprising that the archon does also because also in the *Athenaion Politeia* (3.3), of only a generation earlier, it is explicitly stated that "the archon administers no one of τὰ πάτρια but simply the 'added ones' (τὰ ἐπίθετα)." And the wife of the basileus is given to Dionysus as a wife and performs τὰ πάτρια τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς on behalf of the polis, πάτρια that are many, sacred, and secret (πολλὰ καὶ ἅγια καὶ ἀπόρρητα) ([Dem.] 59.73).

According to Demosthenes (21.51), the Athenians were ordered by the oracles at Delphi and Dodona to make choruses at the City Dionysia κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. Later Demosthenes (54) adds the "wearing of the crowns" (στεφανηφορεῖν) κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[21]

A few other religious activities of the polis were also expressly governed by τὰ πάτρια. The priestess of Athena Polias "adorned the table" κατὰ τὰ [πάτρια],[22] and a kanephoros was "to carry the basket for the god (Dionysus) κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[23] The polis decrees, probably 440–435, that the ἀπαρχαί of grain for the Eleusinian deities are to be made κατὰ τὰ πάτρια and that three silos

13 *I. Eleusis* 229.8–10 of 165/4.

14 R&O #46.5–6 of ca. 360.

15 *SEG* 25.140.2–8.

16 *IG* II^2 1247.4–7 of mid. III BC.

17 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.57–8.

18 *SEG* 45.101.25–27.

19 *Agora* 16.181.10–12.

20 Cf. [Lys.] 6.4.

21 On the oracles reputedly documenting these claims (21.52–3), see Appendix 1.

22 *IG* II^2 776.10–13 of 237/6.

23 *IG* II^3 1284.10–11 of 186/5.

are to be built for storage of grain, again κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[24] Prytaneis in 140/39 "dedicated the εἰρυσιώνη to Apollo κατὰ τὰ πάτρια."[25] The agonothetes of 252/1 completed the "pre-contests" (προαγῶνες) in the sanctuaries, probably those of the Dionysia and Lenaia, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια,[26] and, in a variant of the formula ([ὡς μάλισ]τα τοῖς πατρίοις ἀκολούθως, "especially following τὰ πάτρια"), ephebes of 203/2 made the *pompai* of the Semnai and of Iakchos.[27] The astynomoi, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, had supervision over the sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos.[28] The demesmen of Piraeus, in regulations concerning their Thesmophorion, tell of the women who assemble for the Thesmophoria, the Plerosia, the Kalamaia, and the Skira, and on any other day κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[29] And to the list we may add both the Pythaïdes (*SEG* 21.469C) and the Pythia which was, according to Demosthenes (19.128), a πάτριος θεωρία. But, despite the list above, in the epigraphical texts τὰ πάτρια are primarily associated with sacrifices, and when an individual is praised for both sacrificing and performing other religious duties like supervising a *pompe* or putting on *agones*, τὰ πάτρια are usually associated only with the sacrifices, not with the other activities.[30]

τοῖς ἀλλοις θεοῖς οἷς (θῦσαι) πάτριον ἦν ("to the other gods to whom it was ancestral (to sacrifice)")

The prytaneis regularly sacrificed before meetings of the Ekklesia to Apollo and Artemis Boulaia and τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον ἦν from at least 259/8 to 95/4, and to these deities were later added Artemis Phosphoros and, once, Zeus Ktesios.[31] This "omnibus" formula is used for a number, but a rather

24 *I. Eleusis* 28a.3–4, 10–11, 24–6, 33–4. Cf. Isoc. 4.31.

25 *Agora* 15.240.11–12.

26 *IG* II^2 780.15–16. Cf. Pickard-Cambridge, 1988.67. On τὰ πάτρια in the City Dionysia, see also Dem. 21.51 and 54.

27 *IG* II^3 1176.9–10. ἀκολουθῶς with τὰ πάτρια is found only here in inscriptions and literary texts.

28 *IG* II^2 659.8–12 of 283/2.

29 *IG* II^2 1177.8–12 of the mid-IV BC.

30 As examples, *Agora* 16.181.10–12 of 282/1, *IG* II^3 1284.34–6 of 186/5, and II^2 956.1–11 of 161/0.

31 We can see this prytany formula develop. In the first sure instance, of 273/2, the sacrifice was to Apollo Prostaterios καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἷς πά[τριον ἦν] (*Agora* 15.78.5–6). In the second, of 267/6, the sacrifice was only τοῖς θεοῖς οἷς π[άτριον ἦν] (15.81.5–6), but that may have been the earliest form of the formula (see 15.76.8–9 of 279/8). After 259/8 the sacrifice is commonly to Apollo Prostaterios and Artemis Boulaia καὶ τ[ο]ῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον ἦν (*Agora* 15.89.7–9 of 259/8). In *IG* II^3 1304.9 of 180/79 (?) Zeus Ktesios is uniquely added to the group. Artemis Phosphoros first joins Apollo Prostaterios and Artemis Boulaia in *SEG* 40.170.6–8 of 175/4 and thereafter is often included. A sacrifice to her is designated

limited number, of sets of gods. The same formula is used for gods associated with Asclepius and Hygieia, the deities to whom the priest of Asclepius regularly sacrificed.[32] In 252/1 an agonothetes and in 106/5 the ephebes and their kosmetes sacrificed to Dionysus καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον ἦν.[33] Demeter and Kore had other gods associated with them by the same omnibus formula in sacrifices by the epimeletai of the Mysteries[34] and in sacrifices at the Haloa and Chloia by the demarch of Eleusis.[35] In 250/49 the priestess of Aglauros sacrificed at the *eisiteteria* to Aglauros, Ares, Helios, the Horai, and Apollo καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον ἦν.[36] In 273/2 the same formula is used for the gods associated with Amphiaraus in his priest's sacrifice.[37] The strategos commanding the garrison at Rhamnous sacrificed there to Themis and Nemesis καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον ἦν,[38] and, finally, the epimeletai of the *pompe* of the City Dionysia in 186/5 sacrificed simply τοῖς θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον ἦν.[39]

πάτριόν ἐστι ("it is ancestral")

Although common in other contexts, this phrase is very rare in religious matters.[40] It was πάτριον for the physicians in public service in Athens to sacrifice, twice a year, to Asclepius and Hygieia "on behalf of themselves and of

---

separately from the others in *Agora* 15.183.8 and 184.8 of 182/1 and in 15.240.8–9 of 140/39. On the cults of these gods in this period, see Mikalson, 1998.113–16, 195, and 255.

32 *SEG* 18.19.7–8 and 34–36 of 244/3, *SEG* 18.26.9–11 of 137/6, and *IG* II^2 976.3–5 of 150–100.

33 *IG* II^2 780.7–8 and 1011.66–7 and 76.

34 *I. Eleusis* 192.12–14 of 249/8 and *IG* II^3 1164.12–15 of 214/3. Cf. *IG* II^3 1188.1–4.

35 *I. Eleusis* 229.6–8 of 165/4. For the Haloa see also *I. Eleusis* 196.9–10.

36 *SEG* 33.115.10–14. The profusion of deities here brings to mind the many deities who were called to witness the oath of the ephebes, held in the sanctuary of Aglauros. In addition to Aglauros and Ares were Hestia, Enyo, Enyalios, Athena Areia, Zeus, Thallo, Auxo, Hegemone, and Heracles, some of whom may be understood among οἱ ἄλλοι θεοί of our text. For oath see R&O #88; for deities, Mikalson, 1998.164–6.

37 *SEG* 32.110.8–9.

38 *I. Rhamnous* II.32.10–11.

39 *IG* II^3 1284.35–6. Private associations rarely used this formula. Of *koina*, the priestess of the Syrian Aphrodite sacrificed to her καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θε[οῖς οἷς πάτρι]ον ἦν (*IG* II^2 1337.5–7 of 97/6). The thiasotai of Aphrodite, interestingly, in 302/1 uniquely apply the formula to the sacrifices, not to the gods receiving the sacrifices: τὰς [θ]υσίας ἔθυσε τοῖς θεοῖς ἃς πάτ[ρ]ιον ἦν αὐτοῖς (*IG* II^2 1261.30–2).

40 The phrase is equally rare in documents of *koina*. In 243/2 thiasotai of Bendis on Salamis honored epimeletai who "supervised the sacrifices" ὡς αὐτοῖς πάτριόν ἐστι (*SEG* 59.155.3–4), and about the same time other officials of the same cult also supervised sacrifices καθ' ἃ πάτριόν ἐστι (*SEG* 44.60.3–4).

the bodies which each had healed."[41] Melanthius (*FGrHist* 326 F 4) reports that it was πάτριον for initiates in the Mysteries to dedicate to the gods the garments in which they were initiated. Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328 F 67) reports that, unlike on the Acropolis today, πάτριον δ' ἐστι for the Athenians that a dog not climb into the Acropolis.

If it was πάτριον to sacrifice "to the other gods" with whom the primary recipients were associated, we may assume that it was also πάτριον to sacrifice to the primary recipients, and that these sacrifices could be termed πάτριοι θυσίαι. If so, we can draw up a list of those gods whose sacrifices were determined by τὰ πάτρια. To these and other elements we have seen to be κατὰ τὰ πάτρια we may add other sacrifices, *heortai*, or rituals linked to τὰ πάτρια in non-epigraphical texts: the Choes, the rituals performed by the wife of the basileus,[42] the sacrifices by the hierophant at Eleusis, practices of the *parasitoi* of Heracles, and a sacrifice to the Hero Archegetes, probably Erechtheus.[43]

τὰ πάτρια in Phratries, *Gene*, and *Koina*

Phratries, *gene*, and *koina* also had their own πάτρια. Those of the phratry of the Deceleieis concerned their sacrifice to Leto (Lambert, 1993.294.T4). One of our earliest documents, *IG* I^3 7 of 460–450, records the decision of the Ekklesia, at the request of the *genos* Praxiergidae, to inscribe on stone "the oracle" of Apollo and the *psephismata* previously made concerning them. These then are apparently listed as τὰ πάτρια and involve administrative and financial details concerning, most probably, the Plynteria or Kallynteria, but if one is πάτριον, so, too, must the other be. In a sense these would be τὰ πάτρια of both the polis and the Praxiergidae.[44] Those of the *genos* of the Salaminioi are best attested and most abundant. In their decree of reconciliation (R&O #37 of 363/2), they are to sacrifice (25–6, 80), distribute loaves of bread (41–7), establish the *oschophoroi* and *deipnophoroi* (47–50), and give out the perquisites of a sacrifice (63–5), all κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[45] In a similar document of reconciliation the two parts of the cult of Bendis, one in the city, one in Piraeus, sort out their responsibilities and intend that "the sacrifices to the gods and the other things

41 *IG* II^2 772.9–13 of the archonship of Diogeiton (269/8?).

42 On which see Carlier, 1984.331–5.

43 Choes, Ar. *Ach*. 1000–1001; wife of basileus, [Dem.] 59.73; hierophant, [Dem.] 59.116; *parasitoi*, Philoch., *FGrHist* 328 F 73 and Polemon, frag. 78—on the *parasitoi* and their relationship to the basileus, see Carlier, 1984.336–7; and Archegetes, Dem. 43.66.

44 On this text see Parker, 1996.307.

45 On the Salaminioi and this text, see Taylor, 1997.47–63, Lambert, 1997, and Parker, 1996.308–16.

which are appropriate happen κατὰ τὰ πάτρια of the Thracians and κατὰ τοὺς νόμους of the city."[46] We investigate the role of *nomoi* in cult later, but here note that τὰ πάτρια are those of the goddess' homeland, the *nomoi* those of Athens which has allowed the cult, one of which orders the devotees of the cult to send a *pompe* from the Prytaneion to Piraeus (9–12). In 278/7 a *koinon* of an unknown goddess praised its epimeletai and grammateus who sacrificed all the sacrifices [κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὰ νόμιμα.[47] The νόμιμα here surely represent "laws" or "customs" of the *koinon*, not of the polis. About the same period the priest of another *koinon* of another unknown goddess sacrificed κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[48] Without knowing the deities, we cannot determine whether these πάτρια go back to a foreign country or are simply those of the *koinon*. *IG* II^2 1325 of 185/4 and 1326 of 176/5 suggest that practices in these *koina* did not have to exist long before they were considered πάτρια. This citizen cult of the Dionysiastae had probably not existed for much more than a decade when the members were coming together to sacrifice each month to Dionysus κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[49] Finally, in 302/1 the Citian *thiasos* of Aphrodite Ourania held their *pompe* of the Adonia *heorte* [κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια, and these πάτρια were most likely foreign, those of Aphrodite in Cition.[50]

We summarize the religious elements at least in part controlled by τὰ πάτρια in the following lists.

Religious Activities, by Deity Receiving Them[51]

Aglauros, Ares, Helios, the Horai, and Apollo: sacrifice of *eisiteteria*, by priestess of Aglauros
Amphiaraus: sacrifice by priest of
Aphrodite Pandemos: supervision of sanctuary by astynomoi

46 *IG* II^2 1283.23–6 of 261/0. On this text see Wijma, 2014.136–9 and Jones, 1999.257–61.

47 *IG* II^2 1277.7–8.

48 *IG* II^2 1289.6–8.

49 On this cult see Mikalson, 1998.204–6.

50 *IG* II^2 1261.9–10.

51 One might expect these deities to be called οἱ πάτριοι θεοί, but the phrase does not occur in Attic inscriptions and only rarely in the prose authors (Lys. 31.31). In Hdt. 1.172.2 οἱ πάτριοι θεοί are distinguished from οἱ ξεινικοὶ θεοί, a quite different matter. They are also not οἱ πατρῷοι θεοί, whom Parker (2008 and 2006.21–3) has shown are associated with *gene* and phratries or phratry-like units, not with the polis. Apollo Patroös in Athens is a special case, linked to this phratry membership but expanded beyond that, on which see Hedrick, 1988.

Apollo: εἰρυσιώνη
Apollo Patroös: sacrifice
Apollo Prostaterios, Artemis Boulaia, Artemis Phosphoros, and, once, Zeus Ktesios: sacrifices by prytaneis before meetings of Ekklesia
Apollo Pythios: sacrifice by Athenians at Delphi, at Pythia
Apollo Zoster: sacrifice by priest of (deme)
Asclepius and Hygieia: sacrifice by priest of
Athena Polias: Kallynteria; sacrifices by Praxiergidae at Plynteria; adornment of table
Demeter and Kore: sacrifice by epimeletai of Mysteries; sacrifices by hierophants; sacrifices by demarch of Eleusis at Haloa and Chloia; ἀπαρχαί of grain, building silos
Dionysus: sacrifices by agonothetes, ephebes and their kosmetes
Erechtheus and Poseidon: sacrifice by priest (tribe)
Heracles: practices of *parasitoi*
Semnai: *pompe* by ephebes
Themis and Nemesis
Theseus: sacrifice at Theseia
gods and heroes: sacrifices by archon of Mesogeioi (*koinon*)

Religious Activities by *heortai* and Recurring Named Rituals

Anthesteria: rituals of wife of basileus
Chloia: sacrifices by demarch of Eleusis (deme)
Choes: drinking of *choes*
City Dionysia: *proagones*, choruses, and wearing of crowns
Deipnophoria: selection of *deipnophoroi* (*genos*)
ἐγγραφαί of ephebes: sacrifice by kosmetes once
Haloa: *agon*, sacrifices by demarch of Eleusis (*genos*)
Kalamaia: administration of and sacrifices at, day of (deme)
Kallynteria: role of Praxiergidae
Mysteries (at Eleusis): administration of; Iakchos *pompe*; dedication of garments
Oschophoria: selection of *oschophoroi* (*genos*)
Panathenaia: sacrifices, carrying of baskets in *pompe*
Plynteria: sacrifices by Praxiergidae
Proerosia: day of (deme)
Pythia: sacrifice and *theoria*
Skira: day of (deme)
Theseia: sacrifice
Thesmophoria: day of (deme)

Other

The sacrifices by the nine archons at the end of their year of service

τὰ νομιζόμενα ("the customary things")

τὰ νομιζόμενα might be expected to be, generally, the equivalent of τὰ πάτρια, but such is not the case. Firstly, τὰ νομιζόμενα is most commonly used of the burial rites for the dead, seen once in our inscriptions and often in the orators and elsewhere.[52] Such rites are never termed τὰ πάτρια and are not our concern here. Secondly, τὰ νομιζόμενα occurs relatively rarely in other religious contexts, and, when it does, τὰ νομιζόμενα are often contrasted to sacrifices, which are most often linked to τὰ πάτρια, as in the religious activities of the wife of the basileus: "so that the secret sacrifices may be made κατὰ τὰ πάτρια on behalf of the polis and so that the customary things (τὰ νομιζόμενα) may happen for the gods εὐσεβῶς and so that nothing may be done away with or innovated" ([Dem.] 59.75. Cf. 59.85);[53] and as in the praise of the kosmetes in Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.10–11: "the kosmetes had spent money from his own funds for the sacrifice and τὰ νομιζόμενα."[54] τὰ νομιζόμενα seem often to refer to non-sacrificial activities, as in Plato, *Symposium* 176a1–4: "After Socrates and the others had reclined and dined, after they had made libations and sung of the god and (done) the other νομιζόμενα, they turned to the drinking."[55] So, too, Thucydides (6.32.1) describes the prayers before the launching of the Sicilian expedition as εὐχὰς τὰς νομιζομένας.

τὰ νομιζόμενα is also used of "perquisites," of Athena's portion of the tribute collected each year (*IG* I^3 49.14–16) and of what is owed to a priest from sacrifices (Aristophanes, *Ploutos* 1185).[56] Lastly, τὰ νομιζόμενα may refer to the

---

52 *I. Rhamnous* 11.26.14–15. For examples in orators and elsewhere, Antiph. 6.37, Isoc. 19.33, Is. 2.4, Lysias 2.9, Dem. 18.243, Aeschin. 1.13, Din. 2.18, and Plato, *Menex.* 249b4.

53 ἵνα κατὰ τὰ πάτρια θύηται τὰ ἄρρητα ἱερὰ ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα γίγνηται τοῖς θεοῖς εὐσεβῶς καὶ μηδὲν καταλύηται μηδὲ καινοτομῆται.

54 Cf. the activities of the priestess of a *genos, SEG* 29.135.5–7.

55 Cf. [Pl.] *Alc.* 11.151b1–2. In each of the following τὰ νομιζόμενα might be linked to sacrifices, but may well be referring to other religious activities: *IG* I^3 21.3–4, Antiph. 5.82, Lysias 63, frag. 125 [Carey], and Arist. *Pol.* 2.1267b33–5. The description of the activities of the hieropoioi in *Ath. Pol.* 54.6–7 and "quotations" of it in much later sources offer a nice example of the change of use of these terms. Pollux, Photius, and other such late sources speak of the θυσίαι αἱ νομιζόμεναι of the hieropoioi, but the *Ath. Pol.*, describing the same sacrifices, does not label them νομιζόμεναι. For relevant references and texts, see Sandys, 1912.211.

56 The Salaminioi describe the distribution of the loaves of bread "from Skiras," and there they are to set aside the loaves τὸς νομιζομένος ἀφαιρεῖσθαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. The apparent

victims or other practices in divination (Hdt. 1.49.1 and 7.140.1 and Thuc. 6.69.2) which are never described as τὰ πάτρια. In short, τὰ νομιζόμενα and τὰ πάτρια appear to refer to quite different religious activities.[57]

τὰ νόμιμα ("the customary things")

τὰ νόμιμα and related expressions, e.g., νόμιμόν ἐστι, are rare in these documents. The one sure example in polis documents is revealing. In *IG* II^3 1313.15–17 of 176/5 νόμιμόν ἐστι is used of the ephebes' usual garlanding of the public tomb at the city (πολυανδρεῖον πρὸς τῷ ἄστει) and of holding a "tomb-contest" (ἐπιτάφιος ἀγών) there. Here it is a matter of νομιζόμενα for the dead, not πάτρια.[58] Otherwise in polis texts it occurs only in reference to oaths.[59] One example is from a Delphic Amphictyonic decree of 117/6, a copy of which was set up in Athens.[60] The demesmen of Piraeus speak of sanctuaries into which it is νόμιμον for only the demesmen to enter.[61] We have already seen a *koinon* of an unknown goddess in 278/7 praise their epimeletai and grammateus who sacrificed [κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὰ νόμιμα, a collocation not found elsewhere in a religious context.[62] Again, demes and *koina* were more casual in the use of some of these terms. τὰ νόμιμα and related expressions are very common in historical, oratorical, and philosophical texts, sometimes in a religious context,[63] but this usage seems not to have carried over to official polis documents.

---

linkage here between τὰ νομιζόμενα and τὰ πάτρια may be explained by the fact that this is a decree of the *genos*, and such decrees by *gene* and private associations are more casual in their expression than are state decrees (R&O #37.41–3). In 7.29 Isocrates may bring together τὰ πάτρια and τὰ νομιζόμενα for the purposes of *variatio*.

57 The phase τῶν νομιζομένων πατρίων of [Dem.] 59.79 (cf. 59.85) should perhaps be taken as "of the things thought to be πάτρια." There is not here a linkage of τὰ νομιζόμενα that we have been discussing and τὰ πάτρια, but the interesting point emerges that some things *are* τὰ πάτρια and others *are thought to be*.

58 For restorations of the terms see, e.g., *IG* I^3 7.10 and 131.10 as restored in *SEG* 13.4 and *Agora* 16.67.1.

59 ὁ νόμιμος ὅρκος as in *IG* II^2 116.19–20.

60 *IG* II^2 1134.35.

61 *IG* II^2 1214.15–17.

62 *IG* II^2 1277.7–8.

63 As in [Dem.] 59.78 and Lycurg. *Leoc*. 129.

CHAPTER 7

Nomoi and *Psephismata*

> Until the end of the fifth century, there was no hierarchy of norms. All legal statutes carried in principle equal authority, because *nomos* (plural *nomoi*; literally 'norm,' and conventionally 'law') and *psephisma* (plural *psephismata*; literally 'that which is voted,' conventionally 'decree') were formally equivalent and interchangeable terms. Any resolution of the fifth-century assembly was as such both a *nomos* and a *psephisma*. This system was changed, however, in the course of the democratic restoration in 403, and *nomoi* were for the first time granted privileged status over *psephismata*. . . . Thereafter, *nomos* was restricted to rules of both general and permanent validity, *psephisma* being used to describe temporary regulations and those applicable only to individuals; no *psephisma* could override a *nomos*, and *nomoi* could no longer be changed by simple majority vote, but only by means of a *nomothesia*, an elaborate and time-consuming procedure in which the assembly had no final say.

This admirably lucid and concise statement of the relationship of *nomoi* and *psephismata* by Todd (1996.122–3) clears much of the terminological and historical ground for the following discussion of *nomoi* and *psephismata* in religious contexts.[1] The question I pose in this section is what elements of Athenian polis religion were governed by *nomoi* and *psephismata* individually or together.[2] Given Todd's distinctions of *nomoi* and *psephismata* before and after 403 BC,

1 For the procedures of *nomothesia* after 403, see now Canevaro, 2013.

2 For a general survey of the distinctions and questions on this issue, see Rhodes, 1987. See also Lambert, 2012a.58–60 and 80 n. 65. Rhodes (2009) also offers a valuable collection of Athenian legislation on religious cults in V and IV BC, as does Lambert (2012a.48–92) for 352/1–322/1. Both should be consulted for the texts below. I would not presume to claim that I have found all legislation on religious matters for the period covered, but I think my collection is at least representative.

I avoid the term "sacred laws." In Athens as in other Greek states some *nomoi* concerned religious matters and some profane matters (in Greek, τὰ ἱερά vs. τὰ ὅσια) but both they and similar *psephismata* followed the same legislative process and had the same force. For this correction of usual modern terminology, see Parker, 2004 and 2005a. esp. 61–63 and Deshours, 2011.33. For the long history of the question, see Petrovic, 2015. *Nomoi* proposed and passed within private cults for their own use, some of which we discuss, are a different matter, sometimes just recommendations for behavior, sometimes with sanctions, but there is no need to

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_010

we have essentially three categories: the *nomoi*/*psephismata* before 403, and the *nomoi* and *psephismata* separately after 403. For reasons that will become clear, I separate out as a distinct category the *nomoi* that later Athenians believed to be those of Solon. For ease of cross-reference within this chapter and in Chapter 9, I number the *nomoi* (**N**), the *psephismata* (**PS**), the *nomoi*/*psephismata* (**N/PS**), and the *nomoi* of Solon (**NS**).

The *Nomoi* of Solon

Lysias 30, *Against Nicomachus*, offers the best evidence for the Solonian *nomoi*.[3] Nicomachus and his fellow *anagrapheis* were charged with "writing up" the Athenian *nomoi* at the end of the fifth century. These *nomoi* included those of Solon, and a part of their work was recording those *nomoi* [**NS 1**] that concerned sacrifices. Following their work, the Demos, apparently by a *psephisma* [**PS 1**], voted to follow their recommendations, to sacrifice both those sacrifices from the Solonian *kyrbeis* and those "from the stelai" (30.17). We learn of none of the recipients of these sacrifices from the Solonian *kyrbeis* and "from the *stelai*," but clearly some major sacrifices central to polis cult were controlled by the *nomoi* of Solon.[4] It is most likely that *nomoi* concerning the basileus and his religious role were Solonian or pre-Solonian, as in the following examples. An early (418/7) *psephisma* [**N/PS 1**] of the polis concerning the renting of the sanctuary of Codrus and Neleus refers to "the *nomos* [**NS 2**] which is established about precincts (περὶ τεμενῶν)." The activity controlled by this *nomos* is that the basileus is to record the renter, the price, and the guarantors, much like the provisions for transfer of funds earlier described as κατὰ τὸν νόμον.[5] This is probably the *nomos* referred to in Dem. 43.58: "those who do not pay

---

term them "sacred" either. For the more usual, expansive use of the term "sacred laws" and the many subjects they treat, see Lupu, 2005.3–111.

3 On the difficult question of whether the *nomoi* of Solon were actually his or were just believed to be so by fourth-century Athenians, see the Introduction, p. 15.

4 A significant number of sacrifices must have been involved. The prosecutor claims that in the previous year sacrificial animals "from the *kyrbeis*" costing three talents were *not* sacrificed as they should have been (30.20). On Lysias 30, the sacrifices, and τὰ πάτρια here, see Chapter 7. On the Solonian sacred calendar, see Parker, 1996.43–55.

5 *IG* I^3 84.14–18, 23–5. On this text see Carlier, 1984.329 n. 30. The sacrifice to Ion on the calendar of the Salaminioi seems to include victims which the state gave ἐκ κύρβεων, that is, from the old *nomoi* of Solon (R&O #37.87). Restorations of *SEG* 21.469C.16–17 of 129/8 would have τ[ίμ]ια for Apollo πρ[ῶ]τον δ[ιὰ νόμων τεταγμέν]<α>, a very interesting notion, but the restorations are uncertain and unparalleled, as is the idea itself.

the rents for the precincts of the goddess and of the other gods and of the eponymous heroes are to lose their citizen rights, they themselves, their families, and their heirs, until they pay the rents."[6] The author of [Demosthenes] 59.75–6 describes an old *stele*, with faded letters, beside the altar in the sanctuary of Dionysus in Limnae, a *stele* which records a *nomos* [NS 3] that prescribes that the wife of the basileus be a citizen and, at marriage, a virgin, so that τὰ ἄρρητα ἱερά may be sacrificed κατὰ τὰ πάτρια on behalf of the city and so that τὰ νομιζόμενα may happen εὐσεβῶς for the gods and so that nothing be done away with or innovated.[7]

A *nomos* [NS 4] attributed to Solon by Andocides (1.111) required a meeting of the Boule in the Eleusinion on the day after the Eleusinian Mysteries. And Aeschines (1.23) claims that it was a *nomos* [NS 5] of Solon that put religious matters (περὶ ἱερῶν τῶν πατρίων) as the first agenda items for meetings of the Ekklesia.[8] In the same passage Aeschines terms the prayers of the herald before meetings of the Ekklesia πάτριοι, and Demosthenes describes them as "assigned by a *nomos*," and adds that they also opened meetings of the Boule. The combination of the two passages allows the conclusion that these prayers were assumed to be the product of a *nomos* [NS 6] of Solon.[9]

There are a number of possibly, indeed probably, Solonian *nomoi* from various other sources. The speaker of Lysias 26.6 claims that on the day of the sacrifice to Zeus Soter it is impossible to hold the lawcourts contrary to the *nomoi*. The Athenians rarely held lawcourts on their days of *heortai* and sacrifices,[10] and the speaker here is focused on only one day and one sacrifice, but perhaps the *nomoi* [NS 7] determined or formalized this for a whole number of polis religious events. Aeschines (3.176) claims that the lawgiver,

---

6 On the *nomos* περὶ τῶν τεμενῶν see Behrend, 1970.59–60.

7 Aristotle (*Pol.* 6.1322b26–9), in describing Greek practices in general, writes of the *nomos* which assigns some sacrifices not to priests but to government officials. If one wishes to apply this to an Athenian context, it may be a *nomos* of Solon or earlier *nomoi* which assigned certain sacrifices to the basileus. See Mikalson, 2010.103–4 and Carlier, 1984.370–2.

8 On this, see p. 191. Schwenk #18 as usually restored would uniquely have unspecified activities of certain hieropoioi controlled by *nomoi*, but Lambert (2012a.15–22) has shown that the honorands of this text were not hieropoioi, in part because "there is no suggestion, in the wording justifying the honours, that the duties performed had been of a religious nature." See his text in *IG* II^3 327.

9 Cf. Din. 1.47, 2.14 and 16, and Dem. 18.282 and 23.97. For the sources for and contents of these prayers / curses, see Rhodes, 1972.36–7.

10 Mikalson, 1975.

by whom he presumably meant Solon,[11] keeps outside from the *perirrhanteria* of the Agora the individual who did not serve on military campaigns, and the coward, and the one who deserted his station in battle, and he does not allow him to be given a crown or to enter the polis sanctuaries (τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ δημοτελῆ) [**NS 8**].[12] Aeschines has the same lawgiver establish regulations [**NS 9**] for the Musaia in the schools and the Hermaia in the palaestrae (1.10).[13]

In both Plato's (*Ph.* 58b4–c5) and Xenophon's (*Mem.* 4.8.2) accounts, Socrates' execution was delayed for a month because there was a *nomos* [**NS 10**] that the Athenians must keep their city free from pollution and not execute anyone from the time the *theoria* to Delos, the Delia, left until it returned, and the *theoria* had formally begun the day before Socrates' trial.[14]

According to Aeschines (3.17–18) "the *nomos* [**NS 11**] orders that priests and priestesses be subject to audit, all together and each separately, those who receive only γέρα and pray to the gods on your behalf. And not only privately, but also the *gene* together, the Eumolpidae and Kerykes and all the others." We treat this *nomos* and its provisions, often misunderstood, separately in Chapter 11 when we investigate the range of polis control over priests and priestesses, but here note that it included priests appointed by the *gene* and the *gene* that appointed them. And, perhaps not this specific *nomos*, but other *nomoi* concerning such audits went back to Solon, some perhaps to Draco.[15]

Another *nomos* [**NS 12**] attributed to Solon (Ruschenbusch, #76a) may help to understand the relationship of the polis to private cults: it states that whatever arrangements various secular and religious associations, including orgeones and thiasotai, may make for themselves are valid (κύριον) unless "written documents of the Demos" (δημόσια γράμματα) forbid them. This can be and is generally taken to mean that such associations had autonomy in their internal affairs so long as they did not contradict polis *nomoi*, but there are many questions about the text and its date.[16]

The following *nomoi* also have a Solonian flavor. From Isaeus 6.47–50 two emerge. One [**NS 13**] from 403/2 forbids illegitimate children the right of

11 On which see Fisher, 2001.126–7.

12 Cf. Lycurg. *Leoc.* 142.

13 On these see Fisher, 2001.132–3.

14 On the Delia in general, see Rutherford, 2013.286 and 304–6. For the Delia itself reaching back at least to Solonic times, see Parker, 1996.87–8 and 2005.82–3.

15 On *euthynai*, and that some laws on *euthynai* went back to Solon or even to Draco, see Fröhlich, 2004.331–440 and 443–4 and Rhodes, 1993.114–15, 316–18, 561–4, and 661.

16 On this *nomos* and its many uncertainties see Naiden, 2013.221 and Arnaoutoglou, 2003.44–57.

inheritance of family ἱερά or ὅσια, that is, "sacred" and "non-sacred" things. The "sacred" probably refers here to household cults and tomb cult.[17] The other *nomos* [**NS 14**], less clear and undatable, forbids a female slave and/or a woman of ill repute from entering the sanctuary or seeing any of the rituals of Demeter and Kore, probably at the Thesmophoria. About this *nomos* the speaker claims, "You established as law (ἐνομοθετήσατε) these writings so revered (σεμνά) and showing εὐσέβεια, making acting with εὐσέβεια towards Demeter and Kore and towards the other gods of great importance."[18] Similar are those described by Demosthenes (22.73), that a man who has prostituted himself may not go into the sanctuaries [**NS 15**], and by Aeschines (1.188) that one cannot win a priesthood by allotment if he "is not pure in the body as defined by the *nomoi* (ἐκ τῶν νόμων)" [**NS 16**]. So, too, [Demosthenes] 59.85–6 describes a *nomos* [**NS 17**] that forbids an adulterous woman from entering any of the public sanctuaries, from seeing, sacrificing, and doing any of τὰ πάτρια "on behalf of the polis."

Nomoi / *Psephismata* before 403 BC

The "laws" of Solon are always, understandably, termed *nomoi*, never *psephismata*. In the period from ca. 500 until 403, *psephismata* become common in our texts, but there seems to have been no distinction made between *nomoi* and *psephismata*, and the terms are used interchangeably. In our texts such legislative actions of the Ekklesia in this period are termed *psephismata* at the time they were enacted but are usually referred to as *nomoi* in retrospect, as in **N/PS 8–14**, **16**, and **17** below. But for this period we should make no distinction between the nature or authority of legislative acts that are described in our texts as *nomoi* or *psephismata*, and we treat them as the same thing.

About Priests and Priestesses

By a *psephisma* [**N/PS 2**] (*IG* I^3 35) of ca. 448, the Athenians apparently redefined the selection of the priestess of Athena Nike, making it now by lot from all Athenian women, and provided her (a salary of ?) fifty drachmas and

17 The date suggests that the speaker is citing the version of the *nomos* published by Nicomachus in the republication of the *nomoi*. On these *nomoi* see Wyse, 1904.534–8.

18 ταῦτα τὰ γράμματα, ὦ ἄνδρες, ὑμεῖς οὕτω σεμνὰ καὶ εὐσεβῆ ἐνομοθετήσατε, περὶ πολλοῦ ποιούμενοι καὶ πρὸς τούτω (Demeter and Kore) καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς εὐσεβεῖν.

perquisites, legs and skins, from polis sacrifices to Athena Nike.[19] The priestess of Athena Polias was required by a *psephisma* [N/PS 3] to affix a (her?) seal to certain written records (Lycurgus, frag. 6.4 [Conomis]).

The Praxiergidae were not priests but a *genos* with certain important roles in the cult of Athena Polias,[20] and by a *psephisma* [N/PS 4] the Ekklesia accepts their request and records on an inscription Apollo's oracle about their role and also previous *psephismata* concerning it (*IG* I^3 7 of 460–450).

About Sacrifices

Before the battle of Marathon the Athenians had vowed that they would sacrifice to Artemis Agrotera each year as many she-goats as the Persians they killed. After they killed "countless" numbers of Persians (about 6400 according to Herodotus 6.117), Plutarch (*Mor*. 862c) has the Athenians, by a *psephisma* [N/PS 5], ask the goddess that they sacrifice only five hundred she-goats each year.[21] Here, uniquely, an Athenian *psephisma* serves as a request to a deity to modify the terms of a vow.

The very fragmentary *IG* I^3 136 of 413/2 (?) is a *psephisma* [N/PS 6] treating major elements of the cult of Bendis.[22] It describes prayers, sacrifices, *aparche*, the statue of Bendis, a *pannychis*, the priest, dispensation of perquisites, and some financial arrangements.

IG I^3 130 of ca. 432, records a *psephisma* [N/PS 7] by which a sacrifice is to be made to Apollo at Phaleron, a fee of one drachma per ship is levied on those anchoring at Phaleron and is to be paid to the god, and five hundred drachmas are to be spent for construction.

About Heortai

The Panathenaia and the Dionysia and most other *heortai* were surely, in the form we know them, post-Solonian, and so, too, the legislation that formed them. Lycurgus (*Leoc*. 102) reports that "the fathers were so serious about

19 On this text, see Osborne, 1999.344, Parker, 1996.126–7, Mark, 1993.135–8, and M&L #44. For a payment of fifty drachmas to this priestess through a *psephisma*, in 424/3, see *IG* I^3 36 which refers to *IG* I^3 35.

20 On whom see Parker, 1996.307–8.

21 Xenophon (*An*. 3.2.12), telling the same story, says simply that it was decided by the Athenians (ἔδοξεν) to sacrifice the five hundred she-goats. Plutarch's account seems better to reflect what would be required in altering the terms of a vow. See also schol. to Ar. *Eq*. 660 and Aelian *VH* 2.25.

22 The cult had already been established in Athens, perhaps by a *nomos*, by 429/8. On its establishment see below, pp. 000–000.

Homer" that they made a *nomos* [N/PS 8] which required the recitation of his poetry at each quadrennial Panathenaia.[23] Demosthenes claims (21.51–5) that Athenians make choruses and the hymns of the City Dionysia "not only according to the *nomoi* [N/PS 9] about the Dionysia but also according to oracles received from both Delphi and Dodona. From this speech which Demosthenes wrote against Meidias in 347/6 we learn of several *nomoi* concerning the choregoi, choruses, and other aspects of the City Dionysia.[24] In the course of the speech Demosthenes has read out or discusses a number of *nomoi*, including: 1) the *nomos* of Euergus [N/PS 10], dated to the first half of IV BC, which forbade legal proceedings, distraint, or the collection of overdue debts during the City Dionysia, the Dionysia in Piraeus, the Lenaia, and the Thargelia, all *heortai* with choral performances (21.10–11);[25] 2) a *nomos* [N/PS 11] concerning the allotment of choice of flute players to choregoi by the archon (21.13); 3) a *nomos* [N/PS 12] concerning challenges to chorus members as non-Athenians (21.56–7);[26] 4) a *nomos* [N/PS 13] establishing a special session of the Ekklesia, in the theater of Dionysus immediately after the *heorte*, in which anyone could file a complaint concerning the archon's handling of the *heorte* or concerning any individual who committed an act of ἀδικία or ἀσέβεια during the *heorte*.[27] If the Ekklesia voted in favor of the complainant, the matter was referred to the law-courts (21.8–9).[28] To these we may add a *nomos* [N/PS 14] that bid metics to carry trays and their daughters *hydriai* and parasols.[29] The display of surplus collected tribute in the theater during the *heorte* was ordered by a *psephisma* [N/PS 15].[30]

---

23 On this see Shear, 2001.365–8 and 524.

24 On this speech, see MacDowell, 1990. Harris (1989) argues against MacDowell (23–8) that it was in fact delivered by Demosthenes. For more on the speech and an annotated translation, see Harris, 2008.75–166.

25 Harris (2013a.216–23), however, shows the numerous problems with this *nomos*, surely a forgery, in opposition to MacDowell (1990. 230–1) who thinks it genuine.

26 On this *nomos* and the procedures, see MacDowell, 1990.275–7.

27 ἀδικεῖν περὶ τὴν ἑορτήν, 21.180, and ἀσεβεῖν περὶ τὴν ἑορτήν, 21.199. For examples of such misbehavior, apart from those of Meidias, see 21.175–81. On these meetings and for honors awarded, especially to foreigners, during these meetings in the Lycurgan period, see Lambert, 2012a.337–62.

28 On this law, its date and procedures, see MacDowell, 1990. 13–23 and 226–7. A similar procedure was later established, by a *nomos*, for the Eleusinian Mysteries (Dem. 21.175). For the date see MacDowell, 1990. 392–3.

29 Suda s.v. ἀσκοφορεῖν and σκαφηφόροι, and Pickard-Cambridge, 1988.61.

30 Isoc. 8.82.

For the Thargelia a *nomos* [**N/PS 16**] was apparently introduced to have a choregos serve not one tribe, as before, but two.[31] Athlothetai of the quadrennial Panathenaia of the mid-third century apparently also managed δικαίως καὶ κατὰ τὸ[ν νόμον] the *agones* and all other responsibilities that fell to them (*IG* II^2 784.7–11) [**N/PS 17**].

These *nomoi*, importantly, affect primarily the *agones*, the choral competitions of these *heortai*, or the *pompai*, not the sacrifices or rituals.[32]

IG I^3 14 (= M&L #40) is a *psephisma* [**N/PS 18**] of 453/2 (?) creating a whole set of regulations for the Ionian city of Erythrae, including that it must send to the quadrennial Panathenaia grain worth not less than three minae and then distribute this grain to the Erythrians present at the *heorte*. In 448/7 the Athenians, also by a *psephisma* [**N/PS 19**], required every "ally" to send a cow and a panoply to Athens for this *heorte* (*IG* I^3 34.41–3).[33] By a *psephisma* [**N/PS 20**] of 439/8 (?) the Athenians ordained, among other things, that its new colony at Brea was to send a cow and a panoply to the quadrennial Panathenaia and a phallus to the City Dionysia (*Agora* 16.7.11–13 = M&L #49).[34]

IG I^3 82 of 421/0 [**N/PS 21**] seems primarily concerned with the activities of the hieropoioi of the Hephaisteia, the *heorte* of Hephaestus and Athena. These hieropoioi are to handle the sacrifices, the distribution of meat, and unruly participants. They are also to supervise the torch race and the prizes. The document seems to be establishing hieropoioi, or to be revising their duties, for a preexisting *heorte*.[35]

About Sanctuaries and Buildings

I. Eleusis 28a [**N/PS 22**] of ca. 440–435 not only dealt primarily with the first-fruits to Eleusis, as we shall see, but also included a provision (54–9) that the basileus mark the boundaries of the sanctuaries in the Pelargikon, and that hereafter no one be allowed to set up an altar in the Pelargikon without the consent of the Boule and Demos or to cut and remove stone or earth from it.

By what was surely a *psephisma* [**N/PS 23**] there was established an annual tax on cavalrymen (two drachmas), hoplites (one drachma), and archers (one-half drachma) for the support of the sanctuary of an Apollo.[36]

---

31 Dem. 20.28. Cf. Antiphon 6.11. See Pickard-Cambridge, 1988. 75 n. 2.

32 *SEG* 54.114 offers comments on an unpublished *nomos* (*Agora* I 7495) of 354/3 reportedly establishing a tax for funding the Hephaisteia or some part of it.

33 Cf. *IG* I^3 71.55–8.

34 On this see Rutherford, 2013.254–5 and Shear, 2001.141–3 and 187–95.

35 On the Hephaisteia and this text, see Wijma, 2014.86–94 and Parker, 2005.471–2.

36 *IG* I^3 138 of, apparently, before 434. On this text see Jameson, 1980.

In 418/7 the polis passed a *psephisma* [**N/PS 24**] to rent out the sanctuaries of Codrus, Neleus, and Basile, and, as part of the process, to determine the boundaries of the sanctuaries, ὅπος ἂν ἔχει ὁς βέλτιστα καὶ εὐσεβέστα<τα> (*IG* I^3 84).

In terms of buildings in sanctuaries, by a *psephisma* [**N/PS 2**] (*IG* I^3 35) of ca. 448 the Athenians, in addition to reorganizing the selection and other matters concerning the priestess of Athena Nike, order also the design and building of a new temple and altar. The *psephisma* [**N/PS 25**] of *IG* I^3 64A of 440–415, probably ca. 424/3, concerns the designing of the Athena Nike temple, including the provision that the Boule send a probouleuma to the Ekklesia on matters about funding.[37]

The *psephisma* [**N/PS 26**] in *IG* I^3 82 of 421/0 on the Hephaisteia included a provision that the Boule have built the altar for Hephaestus (36–8).

About the Cult of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis

Eleusis was more than any other sanctuary under polis control, and the legislation reflects that. *I. Eleusis* 13 of ca. 500, our earliest *psephisma* [**N/PS 27**], found at Eleusis, orders the hieropoioi of the Eleusinians to make specific sacrifices to various Eleusinian deities, probably as preliminaries to the celebration of the Mysteries themselves. This text may be an addition or amendment to a *nomos* of Solon, perhaps of his calendar.[38] The surviving portion of *I. Eleusis* 30 of ca. 432/1, found at Eleusis, records an amendment [**N/PS 28**] to a larger, lost *psephisma* and concerns the election, pay, duties, and term of annual epistatai at Eleusis, who are now to oversee annual revenues that came to sanctuaries of Demeter at Eleusis, Athens, and Phaleron and the collection of debts. The latter involved participation of the Boule.[39] *I. Eleusis* 41 of 422/1 records a *psephisma* [**N/PS 29**] to build a bridge at state expense over one of the Rheitoi, small lakes on the road from Athens to Eleusis, so that "the priestesses may carry τὰ ἱερά as safely as possible."[40]

It was πάτριον for Athenians from earliest days, surely well before Solon's time, to give a tithe of their annual grain harvest, an *aparche*, to the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis.[41] In the mid-430's the polis [**N/PS 30**] revised

37 On this text see Mark, 1993.108–10, 138–40.

38 On this and on the whole text, see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.32–7.

39 On this text see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.53–8.

40 On this text see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.62–3.

41 On all matters concerning this *aparche*, and on the inscriptions treated below, see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.5–7, 45–53, and 133–5.

a number of provisions concerning the *aparche*, including among other things the determination of the amount (for demes, 1/600 of the barley produced and 1/1200 of the wheat) and, most notably, the requirement that all allied states make the *aparche* and the request that all Greek states do it.[42] This was not, however, an ordinary *psephisma*. It called for the publication of a report of a specially appointed committee, the *syggrapheis*. The *syggrapheis* here appear to be functioning almost as the later nomothetai.[43] It is worth noting that *I. Eleusis* 28a.24–26 refers not to a prior *nomos* but to τὰ πάτρια and a Delphic oracle, perhaps recent, regarding the *aparche*.

In ca. 415, probably by a *psephisma* [**N/PS 31**], the Athenians proclaimed a reward of 6,000 drachmas if anyone killed Diagoras the Melian who had "denigrated" and "made public" the Mysteries, or 12,000 drachmas if someone brought him live back to Athens. The *psephisma* was recorded on a bronze *stele*.[44] The Athenians also voted by *psephismata* [**N/PS 32**] to offer rewards to those who gave information on the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries in 415, the first by Cleonymus offering 1000 drachmas, the second by Peisander offering 10,000. And at the *agon* of the Panathenaia that year Andromachus received the 10,000, Teucrus the 1,000 (Andoc. 1.27). At the same time Isotimides proposed and had passed a *psephisma* [**N/PS 33**] which prohibited from the sanctuaries those who had performed and confessed to an act of *asebeia* (1.71–2).

Plutarch (*Per*. 32.1–2) is the sole source for a *psephisma* [**N/PS 34**], proposed by the seer Diopeithes just before the Peloponnesian War, that those should be brought to trial who "did not respect the divine things in the traditional ways" (τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομίζοντας) or who "taught accounts about the things above the earth" (λόγους περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων διδάσκοντας). Obviously this *psephisma* is critical to an understanding of Pericles' relationship with Anaxagoras and of Socrates' trial, but doubts have been raised about its language, about whether it was ever passed, and whether it is a late fabrication.[45]

---

42 *I. Eleusis* 28a. Cf. Isoc. 4.31 of ca. 380. On this text see also M&L #73.

43 The major difference is that the proposals of the *syggrapheis* required approval by the Ekklesia, those of the nomothetai did not.

44 Melanthius, *FGrHist* 326 F 2 and Craterus, 342 F 16.

45 On this *psephisma* and these questions see Parker, 1996.208–9. His conclusion is that "apart from a lack of supporting evidence, there is no very strong reason to be suspicious."

Nomoi and *Psephismata* after 403 BC

Elements of the religious activities of the ephebes were subject to the *nomoi* and *psephismata*, although reference to them is not as frequent as one would expect considering their abundant religious activities described in these texts. When *nomoi* and *psephismata* are paired, *nomoi* are, not surprisingly in this period, always given the first position. In 213/2 the ephebes are praised for sacrificing to the gods, "following ([ἀκολούθως]) the *nomoi* and the *psephismata*" [**N 1+PS 2**].[46] These sacrifices included the *eisiteteria* and those at the ἐγγραφαί,[47] but in *IG* II^2 1011.5–7 of 106/5 these specific sacrifices are governed by *psephismata* alone [**PS 3**].[48] In *IG* II^3 1313.5–9 of 176/5 the ἐγγραφαί are κατὰ τὴν τοῦ δήμου προαίρεσιν ("according to the policy of the Demos"), an unusual phrase in this context, but the ephebes make their other sacrifices "following the *nomoi* and *psephismata* [**N 2 + PS 4**]."[49] Depending on a restoration, in 127/6 all their races in the various *agones*, their torch-races, and *pompai* may have been dictated by *nomoi* and *psephismata* [**N 3 + PS 5**] (*SEG* 15.104.12–15). In the same text their display in weapons at the Theseia and elsewhere was also dictated by *nomoi* and *psephismata* (17–18) [**N 4 + PS 6**]. That these terms are not being used indiscriminately is suggested by the fact that their regular dedication of a *phiale* to the Mother of the Gods was controlled by only a *psephisma* [**PS 7**].[50] A similar distinction is seen in the prytany *psephismata*, where many of the prytaneis' secular activities were determined by *nomoi* and *psephismata* [**N 5 + PS 8**],[51] but their sacrifices were determined by τὰ πάτρια.[52] In 282/1 the archon Euthius is praised for having "sacrificed the sacrifices to the gods κατὰ τὰ πάτρια," having supervised the *pompe* for Dionysus φιλοτίμως, "and having done all the other things concerning his office "honestly and obeying the *nomoi* and *psephismta* [**N 6 + PS 9**] of the Boule and Demos."[53] Here we may also note the honors given to the priest of Asclepius in 284/3. He sacrificed καλῶς κα[ὶ] φιλοτίμως the sacrifices on behalf of the Demos of Athenians, and also, oddly, supervised the allotment of jurors and all the other things the

46 *IG* II^3 1166.15–16. Cf. 1313.7–9.

47 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.6–8 of 122/1. Cf. *SEG* 15.104.5–8 of 127/6.

48 Cf. *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.97–9 of 101/0. In the later documents the *nomoi* seem to have fallen out or been ignored.

49 Cf. Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.15–16 of 122/1.

50 *SEG* 15.104.27–8. Cf. Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.23–4, 79–80, *IG* II^2 1029.24–5, and 1030.35–6.

51 E.g., *IG* II^3 1304.15–18 of 180/79 (?).

52 See Chapter 6.

53 *Agora* 16.181.10–17.

nomoi and the *psephismata* [**N 7** + **PS 10**] assigned him. He did these latter activities δικαίως καὶ κατὰ το[ὺ]ς νόμους, and the text would suggest the *nomoi* and *psephismata* affected only his allotment of jurors and perhaps "the other" secular tasks he may have been assigned by the polis.[54]

Sure examples of both *nomoi* and *psephismata* controlling a religious activity are, thus, only some ephebic sacrifices, *pompai*, and displays in armor at *heortai*. Possible, but unlikely, are also some unnamed religious activities of the priestess of Athena Polias and of the priest of Asclepius.[55]

Nomoi after 403 BC

About Heortai

After 403 new *nomoi* required nomothetai, and in our texts they appear only when major new developments occur in the religious realm. When Oropus was given to Athens by Philip in 335, Athens gained control of the sanctuary of Amphiaraus and instituted a new quadrennial *heorte* there. In 332/1 Phanodemus was honored for the work he did as a nomothetes in this matter, "in order that the *penteteris* and that the other sacrifices to the gods in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus become as beautiful as possible," and he also provided revenues for these things and for the repair of the sanctuary [**N 8**].[56] A *psephisma* [**PS 11**] of three years later refers to the *pompe* for Amphiaraus, the athletic and equestrian *agones*, the ἀπόβασις, and all the other things concerning the *panegyris* "which the Demos assigned (προσέταξεν) to the epimeletai of the *heorte*." This all clearly refers to the content of Phanodemus' *nomos*. Later in the text the Ekklesia seemingly plans to amend the *nomos*: "at the first (meeting of the) nomothetai to propose an additional *nomos* [**N 9**] for the tamias, that the tamias of the Demos give the thirty drachmas, which it was said in the *nomos* to give to the one chosen to watch over εὐταξία, to those

54 *IG* II^2 1163.5–13. Cf. *IG* II^3 359.13–15.

55 In *Agora* 16.270 of ca. 184/3 (?) it is not clear that the *nomoi* and *psephismata* concern religious activities of the hipparchs. So, too, it may have been secular duties of the archon of the Mesogeioi that were controlled by *nomoi* and *psephismata* (*IG* II^2 1245 of 275/4).

56 *IG* II^3 348.10–17. On this text see Lambert, 2011.209 n. 29. It is usually assumed that Phanodemus was the only nomothetes involved. That is, however, not necessarily so. The decree honors *him* for his work as a nomothetes and does not exclude that he worked with others. Lambert (2012a.44 n. 84) thinks Phanodemus may have proposed the *nomos* to the nomothetai.

chosen to watch over the *agon*."[57] All this suggests how detailed the *nomos* of Phanodemus was, at least in financial matters.

IG II^3 447 of ca. 335–330 offers what appears to be a new *nomos* (1–25) [**N 10**] and a *psephisma* (26–62) [**PS 12**] concerning the use of revenues from a newly acquired piece of land called Nea. The *nomos*, whose purpose is that the sacrifice to Athena at the "small Panathenaia" be as beautiful as possible and that the revenue from the new land be as much as possible, prescribes only the details of renting the property. The *psephisma*, by contrast, gives detailed orders to the hieropoioi of the *heorte* on what sacrifices are to be made to which deities, which portions the various participants are to receive, how the revenues from Nea are to be used for various sacrificial victims, and offers guidance on some more general matters concerning the *pannychis* and the *pompe*.[58] The ending of the *psephisma* is lost but probably prescribes the election of the hieropoioi. If in fact the first part of *IG* II^3 447 is a *nomos* and the second part a *psephisma*, as most assume,[59] then this text may be our best single example of how *nomoi* and *psephismata* treated somewhat different areas of religious matters. The *nomos* concerns primarily the revenues and financial matters; the *psephisma* the matters of deities, sacrifices, and other elements of the *heorte*.

For Amphiaraus the nomothetai needed to create a new *heorte*. They laid out the basic structure of the *heorte* and provided funding for it. In the second case the "small Panathenaia" already existed, and the nomothetai were concerned only with the funding. In neither case do the *nomoi* seem to concern themselves with ritual details. That was left, if not to the cult personnel, to the *psephismata*. The question for now is left open whether the distinctions suggested here between a *nomos* and a *psephisma* hold true elsewhere.

A late life of Lycurgus ([Plut.] *X. Orat.* 841f–842b) attributes *nomoi* on religious topics to Lycurgus: one [**N 11**] renewing a defunct *agon* of comedies for the Lenaia; and one [**N 12**] creating a dithyrambic *agon* for a festival of Poseidon in Piraeus, with cash prizes for the winners. Finally we have his *nomos* central to establishing the tragic canon, as an element of the *agones* of the Dionysia, a *nomos* [**N 13**] to have made bronze images of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides and to store their texts in the public archives and to require actors to follow these authorized texts.

---

57 *IG* II^3 355.11–20, 39–45. For discussion and different interpretations of these passages, see Schwenk #50.

58 On the *pannychis* and *pompe* of the annual Panathenaia, see Shear, 2001.75–6, 83–4, and 87–91.

59 For this text, see Naiden, 2013.211–13, Lambert, 2012a. 82–5, Shear, 2001.73–87, R&O #81, Schwenk #17, and Rhodes, 1972.49–52 and 176.

Financial concerns are central to the *nomos* [**N 14**] which Leptines proposed, apparently unconstitutionally, in 355/4 and which eliminated almost all exemptions from liturgies, including those of the *choregiai* (Dem. 20). This *nomos* was passed but apparently was soon repealed.[60] Noteworthy here is the event which the speaker of Dem. 24.27–29 describes. He charges that Timocrates introduced a *psephisma* [**PS 13**] which illegally ordered that on the following day nomothetai be seated "on the pretext of the Panathenaia." By the *psephisma*, which passed, the nomothetai were to consider "the administration" (τὴν διοίκησιν) of the Panathenaia, but, according to the speaker, they took up only unrelated matters and apparently no *nomos* concerning the Panathenaia resulted.

About Cult of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis

We have more *nomoi* for the Eleusinian cult of Demeter than for any other religious activity, and that reflects the particular interest of the polis in the Mysteries, the aparche of grains, and the administration and financing of both. Most complete, though fragmentary in many sections, is *I. Eleusis* 138 [**N 15**] of 380–350, more probably 353/2–348/7. This *nomos* treats the announcement of the Mysteries and the selection and sending of the spondophoroi to the other Greek cities, their reception, and their report; the Sacred Truce surrounding the festival; regulations concerning the initiation preliminary to participation in the Mysteries; the appointment and duties of the epimeletai; the duties of the exegetes; the selection of the hearth-initiate; and regulations pertaining to the initiates and *pompai* and legal procedures for various infractions; and the responsibilities of the epistatai.[61]

In 353/2 nomothetai revised [**N 16**] arrangements of this same institution, and they are here expressly revising "the *nomos* of Chaeremonides about the *aparche*."[62] This *nomos* [**N 17**] of Chaeremonides may have only slightly predated the *nomos* of *I. Eleusis* 142, and, if so, we may see essentially one brief period of *nomothesia* adjusting the *aparche* to the new, limited political circumstances of Athens as well as the provisions of *I. Eleusis* 138. In terms of *nomoi* and *psephismata*, the *aparchai* to Demeter and Kore are regulated by three elements: τὰ πάτρια, perhaps going back to the *nomoi* of Solon; the oracle of Delphi; and a series of *nomoi*. It is noteworthy that the *nomos* of 353/2

60 On all elements of this *nomos* and oration, see Kremmydas, 2012. On repeal of the *nomos* pp. 58–60 and Harris, 2008.20–21. See also West, 1995.

61 For more on this *nomos*, see Appendix 7.

62 *I. Eleusis* 142.7–10.

expressly gave the Demos the authority to decide by a *psephisma* (ψηφίζεσθαι) [**PS 14**] in what way the *aparche* would best be collected (*I. Eleusis* 142.10–13).[63]

Some apparent *nomoi* concerning Eleusis appear also in the orators. Andocides describes a πάτριος νόμος [**N 18**] on a *stele* that concerned the penalty for putting a suppliant bough in the Eleusinion during the Mysteries (1.110 and 115–16). This may be a citation from *I. Eleusis* 19 which, whether a *nomos* or not, looks to be an earlier version of the type of regulations outlined in *I. Eleusis* 138 of nearly one hundred years earlier.[64] Lycurgus proposed a *nomos* [**N 19**] not allowing women to ride on wagons to Eleusis for the Mysteries, a law which his own wife broke ([Plut.] *X. Orat*. 841f–842b).

About Sanctuaries and Dedications

The fragmentary state of *IG* II^3 445 of ca. 335 makes interpretation difficult, but it records a new *nomos* [**N 20**] establishing various forms of new *kosmos* for the Panathenaia and a number of deities, including Zeus Soter, Demeter and Kore, Zeus Olympios, Dionysus, Athena Itonia, Agathe Tyche, Amphiaraus, Asclepius, and Artemis Brauronia. The major concern of this *nomos* is the making of the dedications, sources of funds, the officials responsible, and Delphic approval of the innovations. Lines 1–12 may be either another *nomos*[65] or a *psephisma* detailing punishments for violators of the following *nomos* and providing for the inscription of the text. Lycurgus probably proposed the new *nomos* at a meeting of the nomothetai, and it is closely related to his extensive religious program.[66]

The very detailed *nomos* [**N 21**] concerning the rebuilding of the walls after Chaeronea included also a provision that 500 drachmas be given to the Boule for a dedication, probably after the work was completed (*IG* II^3 429.37–8).

Financial concerns are also prominent in the *nomos* [**N 22**] issued ca. 300–250 by nomothetai concerning the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron, "so that the temple and the things in the sanctuary of the goddess of Brauron may all be safe and sound."[67] It ordered various polis officials, mostly financial ones, to examine the listed buildings and to make and publish an inventory of altars, tables, and "the other things." The architect "for sacred (buildings)" is to go to

63 For a different interpretation of these lines, see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.133.

64 See Clinton, 2005–2008.II.38–43.

65 As is commonly claimed. On this and on this whole text, see Lambert, 2012a.68–9.

66 On Lycurgus' religious program, see Deshours, 2011. 54 and 88–90, Humphreys, 2004.77–124, Mikalson, 1998.11–45 and 288–94, and Parker, 1996.242–55.

67 ὅπως ἂν τὰ ἐν τῶι ἱ[ερῶι τῆς θεοῦ τ]ῆς Βραυρωνίας πάντα σᾶ εἶ καὶ ὑγιῆ καὶ ὁ νεώς, *SEG* 52.104.2–3.

the sanctuary and, first, take care of what the statue needs and, then, through the usual channel of financial officials, make contracts and payments for what other things are in need of repair.

Nomoi Concerning Secular Activities of Priests

We saw in *IG* II^2 1163.8–13 that for the priest of Asclepius *nomoi* and *psephismata* may have affected only his allotment of jurors and perhaps other secular tasks he may have been assigned [**N 7** + **PS 10**]. So, too, in *IG* II^3 359.12–19 of 328/7 *nomoi* [**N 23**] may concern only the priest's secular activities, including maintaining "good order" in the neighboring Theater of Dionysus for which he is praised. But whatever the exact situation, the priest of Asclepius, who also had regularly to report to the Boule on his sacrifices,[68] was more subject to polis *nomoi* than any other priest of whom we have record.[69] The *nomoi* and *psephismata* (restored) of *IG* II^2 776.13–14 [**N 23a** and **PS 14a**] may have also directed only secular activities of the priestess of Athena Polias.

Psephismata after 403 BC

About Sacrifices

Most of the *psephismata* of the polis concerning sacrifices occur in decrees honoring prytaneis, priests, or various lay officials who made them. Preliminary to the actual praise of the official is the declaration that the Demos, on recommendation of the Boule, accepts the "good things" that these officials reported concerning the sacrifices they made "for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos" and various others.[70] The two largest attested interventions of the polis into sacrificial activities are motivated by some major innovations. We have already seen the instructions on sacrifices, the victims, the deities, and the recipients of portions for the annual Panathenaia given to the hieropoioi by the *psephisma* [**PS 12**] of the 330's.[71] Another *psephisma* [**PS 15**]

68 On which see Chapter 4.

69 So, too, the *nomoi* affecting the archon, although they are present in a document primarily describing his religious activities, may deal with only his secular responsibilities (*IG* II^2 668.15–17 of 282/1). The *nomos* in *IG* I^3 84.17–18 of 418/7 may also refer only to secular financial procedures.

70 See Chapter 3.

71 *IG* II^3 447.33–57.

concerns the major restoration of the cult of Apollo, especially Apollo Patroös, two centuries later, in 129/8. The Demos voted that, among many other things, the basileus, archon, and strategoi sacrifice each year new sacrifices to Apollo, sacrifices in addition to those already determined by earlier *psephismata* (ἐπὶ τοῖς προεψηφισμένοις, line 24). Other individuals are also ordered to sacrifice on various other occasions, including priests and priestesses, the herald of the Areopagus Council, the thesmothetai, the tamiai of the stratiotic and grain funds, the tamias of the Boule, and the prytaneis.[72] These two *psephismata* ordered that the sacrifices should be made and sometimes described the financing, the victims, and the distribution of the meat. Nothing of the ritual is specified.

These major interventions of the polis into sacrificial and cult matters through a *psephisma* must, to judge by other evidence, be seen as exceptional.

Other *psephismata* concern individual sacrifices. In the early fourth century a priest of Asclepius, of the sanctuary in Piraeus, recommended the sacrifice of new *prothymata*. The Demos votes [**PS 16**] on the revenue source and the distribution of the meat.[73] Aeschines (3.187) reports the *psephisma* [**PS 17**] which Archinus proposed in 403/2 to honor with a crown the patriots who marched from Phyle and eventually overthrew the Thirty Tyrants and restored the democracy, and to give to them 1000 drachmas for a sacrifice and dedications.[74] In 339 after some victories over Philip II the Athenians by *psephismata* [**PS 18**] held celebratory sacrifices and *pompai* (Dem. 18.216–18).[75] In 304/3 the Demos passed a *psephisma* [**PS 19**] to create sacrifices "on behalf of those who were campaigning" to Athena Nike, Agathe Tyche, and the Soteres (here Antigonus Monophthalmus and Demetrius Poliorcetes). The *psephisma* outlined the financing of the sacrifices and specified that the sacrifices to the Soteres and Agathe Tyche were to be repeated annually as a memorial during the month Elaphebolion, at a cost of 200 drachmas.[76]

At the deme level, similar to the sacrifice voted for Demetrius by the polis in 304/3, the demesmen of Rhamnous in the middle of the third century voted to

---

72 *SEG* 21.469C. On the cults of Apollo and this text, see Hedrick, 1988, esp. 201–2.

73 *IG* II^2 47.23–39.

74 Fragments of this *psephisma* survive as *SEG* 28.45.

75 In 329/8 an *aristeria*, worth 70 drachmas, was made to Demeter and Kore at Eleusis, "according to the *psephisma* of the Boule which Lycurgus proposed" (*I. Eleusis* 177.431–2).

76 *Agora* 16.114. Cf. *SEG* 25.149. On the historical circumstances of these two texts and on the honors given at this time to Antigonus and Demetrius, see Mikalson, 1998.84–5. In 269/8 (?) the Demos made some (now lost) arrangements concerning the twice annual sacrifices which the public physicians made to Asclepius and Hygieia (*IG* II^2 772).

sacrifice to Antigonus Gonatas on the nineteenth of Hekatombaion as part of their Nemesia and to use τὸ ἀγοραστικόν to pay for it.[77] This is probably intended to be an annual event. Near the end of the fourth century the demesmen of Kollytos, for reasons now lost, voted to have πόπανα καὶ πελανό[ν] sacrificed to all the gods and heroes, and that the first sacrifices by the demesmen be to Agathe Tyche "for the safety of the Demos of Athenians."[78] The earliest relevant document for demes in these matters, of ca. 460, appears to be a decree of the demesmen of Skambonidai regulating a number of religious matters, including sacrifices, the distribution and dispensation of sacrificial meats, and perquisites of individual participants. In this it seems a cross between a decree and a sacred calendar.[79] The demesmen of Piraeus in a *psephisma* of 300–250 voted to honor a benefactor, Callidamas of the deme Cholleidai, with, among other things, a portion of the sacrificial meat at their sacrifices and the right to feast with them in their sanctuaries, except where it is νόμιμον for only demesmen of Piraeus to enter.[80] In *I. Eleusis* 85.19–20 of 332/1 we have a decree by the demesmen of Eleusis to buy and lease mines so that for their sacrifice to Heracles "in Acris" the revenue may be as much as possible and so that the sacrifice may be ὡς καλλίστη. So, as far as sacrifices are concerned, we have from polis and deme *psephismata* only two major interventions and a few new sacrifices introduced which include the *prothymata* for Asclepius in the mid-fourth century and the sacrifices for Athena Nike, Agathe Tyche, and Antigonus and Demetrius as a group in 304/3. And the Rhamnousians introduced a new sacrifice for Antigonus Gonatas in the middle of the third century. The scanty activity is noteworthy, as is the focus on financial and administrative matters.

About Heortai

We have already seen the provisions made by the *psephisma* of the 330's for the annual Panathenaia [**PS 12**] and those for the Amphiaraia [**PS 11**] in 329/8, both from the age of Lycurgus. The *psephisma* [**PS 20**] of 129/8 which restored and instituted new sacrifices for Apollo's cult also refurbished and enhanced the Thargelia.[81] Appended to a usual prytany decree is an additional *psephisma*

77 *I. Rhamnous* 11.7.

78 *SEG* 44.42.21–30.

79 *IG* I^3 244. On this text see Humphreys, 2004.145–6. *SEG* 57.124 of the end of the fourth century offers a decree of the Acharnians concerning financial matters of the cult of Athena Hippia.

80 *IG* II^2 1214.6–17.

81 Panathenaia, *IG* II^3 447.26–62; Amphiaraia, *IG* II^3 355.11–20, 39–45; and Thargelia, *SEG* 21.469C.26–7 and 33–7.

[PS 21] providing funds to the prytaneis "so that they may sacrifice the Chalkeia to Athena Archegetis."[82] Money seems also central to the various *psephismata* [PS 22] which, by 149/8, governed the initiation fees (εἰσαγώγεια) of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[83] But in what is surely a *psephisma* [PS 23], *I. Eleusis* 250 of II/I BC records detailed instructions for, especially, the *pompe* from Athens to Eleusis and for the responsibilities of the officials involved. In *IG* II^2 659 of 283/2 the polis orders [PS 24] the astynomoi to make various preparations for the *pompe* of Aphrodite Pandemos in Piraeus, including purifying the sanctuary, anointing the altars, and washing the statues. In a decree of 270/69 it is reported that the polis had voted by a *psephisma* [PS 25], probably in 283/2, to participate in the Ptolemaia in Egypt, chose Callias to be the archetheoros, and gave him 5000 drachmas (which he rejected) for his expenses.[84] Similarly, in 250/49 the polis apparently decided by a *psephisma* [PS 26] to participate in the new Soteria at Delphi sponsored by the Aetolian League.[85] We learn from three decrees [PS 27] honoring the agonothetai of the Theseia in mid-II BC that they had produced the sacrifices κατὰ τὰ πάτρια but had provided the prizes for the competitors κατὰ τὰ ψηφίσματα τῷ δήμῳ.[86] Finally, *SEG* 32.218 reports a *psephisma* [PS 28] which outlined the financing for the Pythaïdes to Delphi, here apparently designating contributions by numerous governmental, religious, and private individuals.[87]

About Sanctuaries, Dedications, and Buildings

In 352/1 the polis by a *psephisma* [PS 29] created a commission to establish the boundaries of the Sacred Orgas and, in addition, created an elaborate divinatory procedure to determine whether the Sacred Orgas should be rented out to be farmed or should be left fallow. Both of these were done regarding the Sacred Orgas [ὅπ]ω[ς] ἂ[ν] ὡς εὐσεβέστατα ἔχει τὰ πρὸς τὼ θεώ (*IG* II^3 292.51–2). When Apollo ordered that they not farm the land, the Athenians, by a *psephisma* proposed by Philocrates, marked off the sacred land with stelai.[88]

---

82 *Agora* 15.78.16–21 of 273/2. On this text see Mikalson, 1998.114–15. On honorary prytany decrees in general, see Hakkarainen, 1997.23 and *Agora* 15, pp. 4–6, 9–10.

83 *I. Eleusis* 233.11–17, on the text and the hierophant honored, see Deshours, 2011.138–40.

84 *SEG* 28.60.55–64.

85 *IG* II^2 680. See Mikalson, 1998.166.

86 *IG* II^2 956.9–11 of 161/0, 957.5–7 of 157/6, and 958.8–9 of 153/2.

87 Tracy, 1982.

88 Philochorus, *FGrHist* 328 F 155.

At the end of IV BC the priest of Apollo Erithaseos, after listing punishments he will impose on slaves or free men for cutting and taking wood from his sanctuary, warns that he will report the names of violators to the Boule and basileus, κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμ[α] τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων (*IG* II^2 1362). This *psephisma* [**PS 30**], though, may refer to strictly legal procedures, not to religious matters.

In 365/4 by a *psephisma* [**PS 31**] the Athenians addressed the responsibilities for and transfer of dedications on the Acropolis, including the statue of Athena, from one year's set of tamiai to the next, and in so doing they referred to a previous *psephisma* [**PS 32**], no doubt on much the same subject, proposed by Androtion, probably about two or three years earlier.[89]

We have only these polis *psephismata* indicating extensive polis involvement in the definition and management of sanctuaries, and it is noteworthy that they are all early, fifth and fourth century. We have seen that *nomoi* controlled some aspects of the use of their Thesmophorion for the demesmen of Piraeus, but by a *psephisma* they voted a legal punishment for those who violated various limitations on access and activities within that sanctuary.[90] Very much later, in 116/5, the residents of Salamis praised those who repaired and adorned some sanctuaries and an *exedra*, and these repairs had been ordered by a *psephisma* of the Salaminians.[91]

The subject of the *psephisma* [**PS 34**] in *IG* II^3 444 of 336–330 is the repair of the statue of Athena Nike that had been dedicated after a series of military victories in 426/5. Also ordered is the sacrifice by the priestess of Athena (Nike) of the ἀρεστήριον that often accompanied the repair or remodeling of dedications.[92] These additions or improvements to sanctuaries also all date to the fifth and fourth centuries.

The polis by *psephismata* also supervised the repair or remaking of dedications in two healing sanctuaries, that of the Heros Iatros and the City Asclepieion. In 220/19 the Ekklesia voted [**PS 35**], upon recommendation of the priest of Heros Iatros, to establish a commission to remake a number of silver models of body parts and other dedications into one *oinochoe*, to be inscribed, "The Boule in the archonship of Thrasyphon from the dedications to Heros Iatros." An ἀρεστήριον, at the cost of fifteen drachmas, is also to be

89 *SEG* 14.47. On the date of Androtion's *psephisma*, see Fornara and Yates, 2007.33.

90 *IG* II^2 1177 of mid-IV BC.

91 *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #2, esp. 18–9.

92 On this text see Lambert, 2012a.66–8 and 2011.206–7, Lippman, 2006.559–60, Mikalson, 1998.42–4, and Mark, 1993.113–114.

sacrificed "to the god" (*IG* II^3 1154). About one hundred years later the priest of the same Heros Iatros secured the approval [**PS 36**] of the Boule for a commission to remake and repair a number of dedications in his sanctuary, including the *oinochoe*.[93] The dedications in the City Asclepieion received similar attention, through *psephismata* of the polis [**PS 37**], in a series that runs from at least 274/3 to the late second century. Provisions are made for the inventorying, transferring to new priests, and the cleansing, remaking, and repair of the dedications.[94] Similar is *SEG* 34.95 of 161/0 which orders by a *psephisma* [**PS 38**] the repair of dedications and then lists a long series of dedications and their donors. The identity of the deity is not certain but is probably Aphrodite (line 47). It may be just coincidence that most such records come from two healing sanctuaries, or it may reflect the current concern of the polis with "health," but its concern for the City Asclepieion fits a pattern.

About Priests and Priestesses

The activities of the priest of Asclepius, as it seems, were more controlled by *nomoi* and *psephismata* than any other. We have already examined *IG* II^2 1163.8–13 with its *nomoi* and *psephismata* [**PS 10**] and *IG* II^3 359.12–19 with its *nomoi* [**N 23**]. In *SEG* 18.22.10–12 of 165/4 the priest of Asclepius is praised for having supervised εὐκοσμία of the temple and for having sacrificed all the sacrifices κατὰ [τὰ] ψηφίσματα [**PS 39**]. Only this last text indisputably refers to religious (vs. secular) activities. Besides the priest of Asclepius, only the priestess of Athena Polias may have acted according to *nomoi* and *psephismata* [**N 23a** and **PS 14a**] and, as we have seen, these, too, may refer to secular duties.[95]

About Divine Honors to Living Humans

We have saved this category of *psephismata* until now because it will become all the more clear how uncharacteristic they are of the over 60 previous *psephismata* on religious matters. In 324 it became clear to Athenians that Alexander, now in Ecbatana, wanted "divine honors." That year the Ekklesia debated Demades' proposal to award such honors to Alexander, and after a contentious debate the proposal passed, as a *psephisma* [**PS 40**]. Soon after Alexander's death in 323 Demades was prosecuted for making the proposal, presumably on a charge of "introducing new gods" or of introducing a proposal

93 *IG* II^2 840. On these texts see Mikalson, 1998.185–6. Cf. *IG* II^2 841 and 842.

94 Aleshire, Inv. IV (274/3), V (244/3), VII (214/3), and IX (late II BC).

95 *IG* II^2 776.13–14, above. The highly restored *SEG* 25.140 of the first half of IV BC seemingly records a decree of the Erechtheis tribe which orders the priest to sacrifice to Poseidon and Erechtheus, specifies the victim, and provides for the financing.

that was "contrary to the *nomoi*" (a γραφὴ παρανόμων). He was found guilty, and the *psephisma* was rescinded.[96]

We have for the Athenians' relationship with Demetrius Poliorcetes a number of *psephismata*, largely because for this there are some good, if not contemporary, literary sources, especially Plutarch's *Life of Demetrius*. In 307/6 Demetrius was received as a liberator in Athens, and the Athenians awarded him a number of honors, some of a religious nature, enacted through a *psephisma* [**PS 41**] proposed by his Athenian supporter Stratocles and approved by the Ekklesia. These honors included statues of Demetrius and his father Antigonus Monophthalmus near those of the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogiton, an altar of Demetrius and Antigonus as the Soteres with a *heorte, pompe*, sacrifices, and *agones*, establishment of them as eponyms for two new tribes, Antigonis and Demetrias, and for their figures to be woven into the *peplos* of Athena Polias.[97] In 304/3 Demetrius returned to Athens, again to liberate it, and received more honors from the Athenians. A sanctuary and altar of Demetrius Katabaites was established [**PS 42**] to mark the spot where he first descended from his chariot (Plut. *Dem*. 10.4 and *Mor*. 338a). Heroic honors including sanctuaries, altars, libations, and paeans were voted [**PS 43**] for three of his generals and agents, each of whom was not an Athenian himself but had prior dealings with Athens (Democharες, *FGrHist* 75 F 1). Stratocles also proposed [**PS 44**] that henceforth Athenian delegations to Demetrius should be termed theoroi, not ambassadors. That meant, as Plutarch interprets it, that they should be imagined as going to Delphi or Olympia for a *heorte* (*Dem*. 11.1 and *Mor*. 338a). That Demetrius was to be the oracular deity for Athens is clear from another *psephisma* [**PS 45**] proposed by Stratocles and passed after a dust-up with Demetrius, that "whatever King Demetrius ordered was 'religiously correct' regarding gods and just regarding men" (Dem. 24.4–5). During these years Demetrius wanted to be initiated into all three levels of the Eleusinian Mysteries and to do so on his schedule and not that of the Mysteries. To make this possible the Athenians voted [**PS 46**], on Stratocles' motion, despite the opposition of the Eleusinian dadouchos, to rename and shuffle various months (*Dem*. 26.1–3). We have also for these years a *psephisma* [**PS 19**], previously described, to create sacrifices "on behalf of those who were campaigning" with Demetrius to Athena Nike, Agathe Tyche, and the Soteres, and specifying that the sacrifices to the Soteres and Agathe Tyche were to be

96 The major contemporary sources are Din. 1.94 and Hyp. 5. frag. 7 and 6.21–22. For other sources, discussion, and the large bibliography on this event, see Whitehead, 2000.455–60, Mikalson, 1998.46–8, Parker, 1996.256–8, and Worthington, 1992.262–4.

97 Diod. S. 20.46.1–4. On this and on the following *psephismata*, on their circumstances and on the Athenian relationship with Demetrius in general, see Mikalson, 1998.75–104.

repeated annually during the month Elaphebolion.[98] For Demetrius' next visit to Athens, in 295/4, now as conqueror and not as liberator, Stratocles proposed and the Athenians voted [**PS 47**] to welcome Demetrius with the kind of hospitality (ξενισμοί) with which they usually welcomed Dionysus and Demeter (*Dem.* 12.1).[99] Also the month Mounichion was to be renamed [**PS 48**] Demetrion and be one long *heorte*, and the thirtieth day of each month was to be Demetrias, and so Mounichion 30, e.g., became the Demetrias of Demetrion (Philochorus, *FGrHist* 328 F 116). The City Dionysia were renamed [**PS 49**] the Demetrieia (*Dem.* 12.2). Finally, when a question about restoring dedications at Delphi arose, in 292/1 Dromocleides proposed [**PS 50**] seeking an oracle from Demetrius, that the Athenians select an individual to go to the Soter (Demetrius) and ask how the Demos might settle the matter "with the most proper respect" (εὐσεβέστατα), "best," and "as quickly as possible" (*Dem.* 13.1–2).

In 224/3 for his guarantees of their security the Athenians made, surely by a *psephisma* [**PS 51**], Ptolemy III Euergetes an eponymn for a new tribe, thereby creating the thirteenth tribe, Ptolemais. His wife Berenice was, in a new form of honor, made the eponym of a new deme.[100]

In response to the aggressions of Philip V of Macedon, the Athenians, ca. 200, passed one or more *psephismata* [**PS 52**] which, among several other matters, rescinded the divine honors awarded to his ancestors. Livy (31.44) offers the best account of this:

> The orators immediately proposed a *psephisma* and the Demos approved it, to the effect that all statues and representations of Philip and their inscriptions, and likewise those of all his ancestors, male and female alike, should be removed and destroyed; that the religious *heortai*, sacrifices, and priesthoods which had been introduced to honor him and his ancestors should be deconsecrated; that the places in which anything had been placed or inscribed in Philip's honor should be put under a curse, and that nothing which by religious law must be placed or dedicated in a "pure" place be put or dedicated hereafter in these places; and that the state priests, everytime they prayed for the Athenian Demos and its allies, armies, and fleets, curse and execrate Philip, his children and kingdom, his land and sea forces, and the whole race and name of the Macedonians.

98 *Agora* 16.114. Cf. *SEG* 25.149.

99 On this "reception" of Demetrius and on the Hymn composed for him, see now Versnel, 2011.444–56 and Chaniotis, 2011.

100 On this see Mikalson, 1998.178–9 and Habicht, 1992.74–5.

The provisions of **PS 48** and perhaps **49** (above) were apparently never implemented, and by **PS 52** many or all of the provisions of **41**, **42**, and **43** were rescinded. By this *psephisma* the two tribes Antigonis and Demetrias were eliminated, as were their eponyms, but about this same time the Athenians voted [**PS 53**], amidst a splendid reception to Athens, that Attalus I of Pergamon, for his assistance against Philip, be made the eponym of a new tribe, Attalis.[101] The resulting twelve tribe structure was to remain in place until the time of Hadrian.[102]

Other

IG II^3 337 of 333/2 records both a (indecisive) probouleuma and a *psephisma* [**PS 54**], the latter proposed by Lycurgus and passed by the Ekklesia, to grant to Citian merchants the right to purchase property on which to found a sanctuary of Aphrodite, "just as also the Egypians have founded the sanctuary of Isis." For a dedication probably from this cult (of Aphrodite Ourania), see *IG* II^2 4636.[103]

We have already surveyed the activities of the ephebes that were controlled by *nomoi* and *psephismata* (**PS 2**, **4**, **5**, and **6**). *Psephismata* (**PS 7**) alone determined their dedication of a *phiale* to the Mother of the Gods, and later documents (**PS 3**) also attributed, probably wrongly, to *psephismata* alone the ephebes' sacrifice of the εἰσιτητήρια. The ergastinai, a much later institution than the ephebes, apparently had their activities regulated only by *psephismata* [**PS 55**].[104]

Incerta

IG II^3 448 [**I 1**] and 449 [**I 2**] may both be either *nomoi* or *psephismata*. Both date ca. 335–300, and both concern *heortai*, neither of which can be certainly identified.[105] *IG* II^3 448 appears to be creating a new *panegyris* with, at the least, equestrian and musical *agones* and with a treaty for safe passage, thereby indicating it was to have an international audience. Suggestions associating it with known or existing Athenian *heortai* include the Panathenaia, Eleusinia, and Amphiaraia. It may possibly be a new *heorte* for Eirene. It may even be in reference to an international festival instituted, not necessarily at Athens,

101 Polyb. 16.25.3–9 and Livy 31.14.11–15.7. His wife, like Ptolemy's, was made the eponym of a deme (Whitehead, 1986.20).

102 On the historical and religious background for **PS 52** and **53** and on Philip's devastation of the sanctuaries of the Attic countryside, see Mikalson, 1998.186–94.

103 On *IG* II^3 337, see R&O #91 and on the cult, Mikalson, 1998.30–1, 103, and 146–7.

104 *IG* II^2 1034.6–12 of 103/2. Cf. *SEG* 53.143.II.12–13 of 108/7.

105 On both see Lambert, 2012a.85–9.

by the Macedonians.[106] *IG* II^3 449 seems concerned primarily with the *agones* of a (still unknown) *heorte*, and officials' roles in them, the prizes awarded, and the recording of victors' names. The polemarch apparently played a major role (lines 19, 32, and 40), but the sacrifice to Athena (line 39) would seemingly exclude the Epitaphia which he oversaw. Scholars have proposed also the quadrennial Amphiaraia and the Bendideia.[107] Whatever the *heorte* may have been, the role of Athenian officials clearly makes it Athenian.

Chart of Polis *Nomoi* and *Psephismata*

The following chart describes the areas controlled by *nomoi* and *psephismata*. Included are the *nomoi* of Solon (**NS**), the legislation before 403 BC (**N/PS**), and the *nomoi* (**N**) and *psephismata* (**PS**) after 403. The areas treated by these naturally fall into the somewhat rough categories of sacrifices and such, priests and priestesses, sanctuaries, and *heortai*. The dates of the non-Solonian *nomoi* and some *psephismata* in most cases do not indicate the enactment of each but the first reference to it. Dates with an asterisk indicate the date of the enactment of the legislation.[108]

Sacrifices and Such

1. Solonian sacrificial calendar, **NS 1**
2. That lawcourts not be held on days of major sacrifices, Solonian (?), **NS 7**
3. Modifying the vow, before the battle of Marathon, on the number of she-goats to be sacrificed to Artemis Agrotera, **N/PS 5**
4. Revisions of provisions for Eleusinian *aparche*, mid-V BC*, **N/PS 30**
   4a. On *aparche* for Eleusis, 353/2*, **N 16**
   4b. Collection of Eleusinian *aparche*, 353/2*, **PS 14**
5. Sacrifice to Apollo at Phaleron, with fee, and construction, ca. 432*, **N/PS 7**
6. For Bendis, 413/2 (?)*, **N/PS 6**
7. Sacrifice and dedication for patriots from Phyle, 403/2*, **PS 17**
8. To accept Nicomachus' revision of State Calendar, late V BC*, **PS 1**

106 Lambert, 2012a.87.

107 Lambert, 2012a.88–9.

108 *IG* I^3 8 has not been included because it is uncertain whether it is a *nomos* or *psephisma* of the Ekklesia. See Goette, 2000.43 and Humphreys, 2004.135.

9. Celebratory sacrifices and *pompai* for victories over Philip, 339*, **PS 18**
10. New sacrifices to Athena Nike, Agathe Tyche, Antigonus, and Demetrius, 304/3*, **PS 19**
11. Ephebic sacrifices, 213/2, **N 1** and **2, PS 1** and **3**
12. Sacrifices to Apollo Patroös and enhancement of cult, 129/8*, **PS 15**

Heortai

Amphiaraia
1. Establishing new *heorte*, 332/1*, **N 8**
2. Changing financial arrangements for, 329/8*, **N 9**
3. Elements of, 329/8*, **PS 11**

Of Aphodrite Pandemos in Piraeus
1. Astynomoi to prepare for *pompe*, 283/2*, **PS 24**

For Bendis
1. Major elements of cult, 413/2 (?)*, **N/PS 6**

Chalkeia
1. Funds for prytaneis to sacrifice at, 273/2*, **PS 21**

City Dionysia
1. Ordering display of surplus collected tribute in the theater, **N/PS 15**
2. Metics' dress and trays, their daughters' hydriai and parasols, **N/PS 14**
3. Ordering colony Brea to send phallus, 439/8 (?)*, **N/PS 20**
4. On choruses and hymns, 347/6, **N/PS 9**
5. No legal proceedings, distraint, or collection of debts, 347/6, **N/PS 10**
6. Allotment of flute players to choregoi by archon, 347/6, **N/PS 11**
7. Challenging non-Athenian chorus members, 347/6, **N/PS 12**
8. Special session of Ekklesia to consider complaints, 347/6, **N/PS 13**
9. Establishing authoritative texts for Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, Lycurgan*, **N 13**
10. Renamed the Demetrieia, ca. 295/4*, **PS 49**

Delia

1. That the city be pure and kill no one during this *theoria*, Solonian (?), **NS 10**

Dionysia in Piraeus

1. No legal proceedings, distraint, or collection of debts, first half of IV BC*, **N/PS 10**

Eleusis and Eleusinian Mysteries

1. Requiring a meeting of the Boule in Eleusinion after Mysteries, Solonian (?), **NS 4**
2. Orders hieropoioi to make sacrifices preliminary to Mysteries, ca. 500*, **N/PS 27**
3. Revisions to *aparche*, with requirement that all allies contribute and inviting other states to do so, mid-430's*, **N/PS 30**
4. The election, pay, duties, and term of annual epistatai at Eleusis, ca. 432/1*, **N/PS 28**
5. To build a bridge at state expense over one of the Rheitoi, 422/1*, **N/PS 29**
6. Rewards for anyone killing or bringing to Athens Diagoras the Melian who had "denigrated" the Mysteries, ca. 415*, **N/PS 31**
7. Penalty for putting suppliant bough in Eleusinion during Mysteries, 399, **N 18**
8. Reward for those giving information on profanation of the Mysteries, 415*, **N/PS 32**
9. Of Chaeremonides, on *aparche*, before 353/2, **N 17**
10. Revisions of *aparche*, 353/2*, **N 16**
11. Provisions for collecting *aparche*, 353/2*, **PS 14**
12. Spondophoroi, Sacred Truce, *myesis*, epimeletai, epistatai, infractions, 353/2–348/7*, **N 15**
13. Not allowing women to ride on wagons to Eleusinian Mysteries, Lycurgan*, **N 19**
14. Reordering months for initiation of Demetrius Poliorcetes, ca. 304/3*, **PS 46**
15. Fees for initiation, 149/8, **PS 22**
16. Provisions especially for the *pompe*, II/I BC*, **PS 23**

Hephaisteia

1. Activities of hieropoioi, 421/0*, **N/PS 21**

Hermaia and Musaia
1. Regulations concerning, Solonian (?), **NS 9**

Lenaia
1. No legal proceedings, distraint, or collection of debts, first half of IV BC*, **N/PS 10**
2. Restoring *agon* of comedies, Lycurgan*, **N 11**

Panathenaia
1. That Homer be recited at each quadrennial Panathenaia, ca. 566/5*, **N/PS 8**
2. Requiring Erythrae to send grain, 453/2 (?)*, **N/PS 18**
3. Requiring all allies to send cow and panoply, 448/7*, **N/PS 19**
4. Requiring new colony Brea to send cow and panoply, 439/8 (?)*, **N/PS 23**
5. Seating nomothetai to consider matters of Panathenaia, before 353*, **PS 13**
6. New *kosmos* for *heorte* and deities, ca. 335*, **N 20**
7. For annual Panathenaia, instructions to hieropoioi on sacrifices, and on use of funds from Nea, ca. 335–330*, **PS 12**
   7a. Use of revenues from Nea, ca. 335–330*, **N 10**
8. Management of *agones* by athlothetai, 239/8, **N/PS 17**

For Poseidon in Piraeus
1. To establish dithyrambic contest, Lycurgan*, **N 12**

Ptolemaia in Egypt
1. Participation in, Callias as archetheoros, 283/2*, **PS 25**

Pythaïs
1. Funding for, 98/7*, **PS 28**

Soteria at Delphi
1. Participation in, 250/49*, **PS 26**

Soteria of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Antigonus Monophthalmos
1. Established, 307/6*, **PS 41**

Thargelia

1. Change in tribal assignments for choregoi, 355/4*, **N/PS 16**
2. No legal proceedings, distraint, or collection of debts, first half of IV BC*, **N/PS 10**
3. Refurbished, 129/8*, **PS 20**

Theseia

1. Prizes for competitors, 161/0, **PS 27**
2. Ephebic display in weapons at, 127/6, **N 4, PS 6**

Other

1. To eliminate all exemptions from liturgies, including *choregiai*, proposed by Leptines, 355/4*, **N 14**
2. Regulations for uncertain *heortai*, 335–300, **I 1** and **2**
3. Ephebic *agones*, torch-races, *pompai*, 127/6, **N 3, PS 5**

Sanctuaries, Dedications, and Altars

1. A man who has prostituted himself may not enter the sanctuaries of the polis, Solonian (?), **NS 15**
2. One who has not served on military campaigns or was a deserter may not enter sanctuaries of the polis, Solonian (?), **NS 8**
3. An adulterous woman may not enter any public sanctuary, Solonian (?), **NS 17**
4. Basileus is to delineate Pelargikon, with no altars to be built there, ca. 440–435*, **N/PS 22**
5. Establish an annual tax on cavalrymen, hoplites, and archers for support of a cult of Apollo, before 434*, **N/PS 23**
6. Design of new temple of Athena Nike, ca. 424/3*, **N/PS 25**
7. Build altar for Hephaestus, 421/0*, **N/PS 26**
8. Renting sanctuary of Codrus and Neleus, 418/7*, **N/PS 1**
9. περὶ τεμενῶν, 418/7, **NS 2**
10. Prohibited from the sanctuaries those who had performed and confessed to an act of *asebeia*, after 415*, **N/PS 33**
11. Concerning dedications on the Acropolis, proposed by Androtion, shortly before 365/4*, **PS 32**
12. The responsibilities for and transfer of dedications on the Acropolis, from one year's tamiai to the next, 365/4*, **PS 31**
13. Boundaries of Sacred Orgas, and farmed or fallow, 352/1*, and demarcating sacred territory, **PS 29**

14. Repair statue of Athena Nike, 336/5–330*, **PS 34**
15. Punishment of sanctuary violators, late IV BC, **PS 30**
16. Provisions for dedication by Boule in *nomos* concerning rebuilding of walls, after 338*, **N 21**
17. Granting Citians permission to purchase property to found a cult of their Aphrodite, 333/2*, **PS 54**
18. Repair of buildings and statue of Artemis of Brauron, ca. 300–250*, **N 22**
19. Inventorying, transfer, cleaning, repair, and remaking of dedications of Asclepius, 274/3* to mid-II*, **PS 37**
20. Remaking and repair of dedications of Heros Iatros, 220/19*, **PS 35** and **36**
21. Repair and inventorying of dedications of, probably, Aphrodite, 161/0*, **PS 38**
22. Ephebic dedication of *phiale* to Mother of the Gods, 127/6, **PS 7**

See also below, **Divine Honors to Living Humans**

Priests and Priestesses

1. That priests and priestesses be subject to audits, Solonian (?), **NS 11**
2. Someone impure in the body may not win a priesthood by allotment, Solonian (?), **NS 16**
3. Inscribe roles and privileges of Praxiergidae in cult of Athena Polias, ca. 460–450*, **N/PS 4**
4. Selection and other matters concerning priestess of Athena Nike, including design and building of new temple and altar, ca. 448*, **N/PS 2**
5. Priest of Asclepius, maintaining good order in theater of Dionysus, 328/7, **N 23**
6. That the priestess of Athena Polias affix a seal to certain written records, **N/PS 3**
7. Secular activities of priest of Asclepius, 284/3, **N 7, PS 10**
8. "Other" activities of priestess of Athena Polias, 237/6, **N 23a, PS 14a**
9. Sacrifices by priest of Asclepius, 165/4, **PS 39**

Divine Honors to Living Humans

1. Awarded, at his request, to Alexander the Great, 324*, **PS 40**
2. To Demetrius Poliorcetes and Antigonus Monophthalmos

   a. Sanctuary, altar, *heorte* as the Soteres, 307/6*, **PS 41**
   b. To be eponyms of two new tribes, 307/6*, **PS 41**
   c. Figures to be woven into Athena's *peplos*, 307/6*, **PS 41**
3. To just Demetrius himself
   a. Sanctuary and altar of Demetrius Katabaites, 304/3*, **PS 42**
   b. To be treated as an oracular deity, ca. 304/3 and later*, **PS 44, 45**, and **50**
   c. Welcome Demetrius in manner usual for Demeter and Dionysus, 295/4*, **PS 47**
   d. Name Mounichion and the thirtieth day of each month after Demetrius, 295/4*, **PS 48**
   e. Rename City Dionysia the Demetrieia, 295/4*, **PS 49**
4. Heroic honors, including sanctuaries, altars, and sacrifices to three generals and agents of Demetrius, 304/3*, **PS 43**
5. Making Ptolemy Euergetes a tribal eponym and his wife a deme eponym, 224/3*, **PS 51**
6. Elimination of divine honors for Demetrius and Antigonus and other Macedonians, including, but not limited to, *heortai*, sacrifices, and priesthoods; putting under a curse places where they were honored; for polis priests to curse Philip and execrate Philip V and the whole race of Macedonians regularly in their prayers on "behalf of the Athenian Demos," ca. 200*, **PS 52**
7. Making Attalus I a tribal eponym and his wife a deme eponym, ca. 200*, **PS 53**

Other

1. Requirements for wife of basileus, Solonian (?), **NS 3**
2. Putting religious items first on agenda of Ekklesia, Solonian (?), **NS 5**
3. Prayers / curses of herald before meetings of Ekklesia and Boule, Solonian (?), **NS 6**
4. Forbidding illegitimate children inheritance of ἱερά and ὅσια, Solonian (?), **NS 13**
5. Forbidding female slaves and women of ill-repute from entering sanctuary or seeing rituals of Demeter and Kore, Solonian (?), **NS 14**
6. Autonomy on internal arrangements for private religious associations, Solonian (?), **NS 12**

7. Bringing to trial those who "did not respect the divine things in the traditional ways" or who "taught accounts about the things above the earth," just before the Peloponnesian War*, **N/PS 34**
8. Regulating ergastinai, 103/2, **PS 55**

Nomoi and *Psephismata* of the Demes

The inscribed *nomoi* of the demes, as contrasted to those of the polis, seem to be more involved in the details of cult. The demesmen of Piraeus in the mid-fourth century set out provisions for their Thesmophorion concerning who and what were allowed in the sanctuary under varying circumstances. They decree (ἐψηφίσθαι) that the demarch fine violators and take them to the *dikasterion*, "using the *nomoi* which are established about these things." They also forbid the collection of wood in the sanctuary, and for violators "the old *nomoi* which are established about these things are to be authoritative."[109] Both may be either polis or deme *nomoi*, the first one determining perhaps only legal procedures, and it is noteworthy that both situations seemed controlled by multiple *nomoi*.[110] It was also surely a *nomos* of the deme of Acharnai that ordered their tamias to make sacrifices to the gods and heroes, to supervise the (local) Dionysia, and to have a silver *phiale* made. *Nomoi* also controlled the sacrifices, *pompe, agones*, and other elements of the same Dionysia by the tamias, demarch, and epimeletes of the *heorte*.[111] It was by a *psephisma* (*SEG* 21.519 of mid-IV BC) that the demesmen of Acharnai decided on the finances to build, as ordered by an oracle, an altar or altars for Ares and Athena Areia "so that the things relating to the gods may be εὐσ[ε]βῶς for Acharnians and Athenians."

Nomoi and *Psephismata* of Private Associations

Private associations also had their own *nomoi, psephismata*, and πάτρια.[112] *IG* II^2 1361 of after the middle of IV BC records a *nomos* of the citizen

109 *IG* II^2 1177.13–21.

110 Arnaoutoglou (2003. 51 n. 60) views these *nomoi* as deme ordinances. Others (see Arnaoutolgou, 50–51) think some Solonian.

111 *SEG* 43.26A.1–8, B1–7 of 315/4.

112 On *nomoi* and *psephismata* of such associations, see Arnaoutoglou, 2003, esp. 125–9.

devotees of Bendis in Piraeus.[113] The cult preexisted this *nomos*, but the *nomos* lays out prescriptions for a whole range of cult matters: sacrifices by members and non-members, perquisites for the priest and priestess, financial arrangements for the repair of the sanctuary and its *oikia*, the scheduling of monthly meetings, money for sacrifices, and other such matters. This *nomos* is intended to be a long-term ordering or reordering of fundamental cult structures, and it is foreseen that someone in the future may attempt to alter some of these arrangements by a *psephisma*. *IG* II^2 1283 of the Thracian devotees of Bendis in Piraeus reveals nicely the interplay of cult τὰ πάτρια, *psephismata*, and of polis *nomoi*. They had their own *nomoi*,[114] but a *nomos* of the city bid them to hold a *pompe* from the Prytaneion to Piraeus (9–11), perhaps part of a *nomos* that granted the devotees ἔγκτησις and ἵδρυσις of their sanctuary (4–7).[115] By *IG* II^2 1283 (δεδόχθαι, 13) of 261/0 the devotees make arrangements for elements of this *pompe* between members in the city cult and those in Piraeus. All of this is done "so that the sacrifices to the gods and all the other things which are appropriate may occur κατά τε τὰ πάτρια τῶν Θραικῶν καὶ τοὺς τῆς πόλ[εως νόμου]ς" (23–6). They need to respect not only their native πάτρια but also the *nomoi* of the city.

The Dionysiastae of Piraeus had three *nomoi*, or one *nomos* encompassing a variety of areas. A *nomos* determined how to honor members, much like the polis *nomos* that did the same. Another determined the succession of priests. A third controlled membership. Their sacrifices were, however, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[116] A *nomos* also controlled the manner of honoring members for the thiasotai of the Carian Zeus Labraundos. For thiasotai of Artemis a *nomos* determined financial contributions of members. Some officials of a *thiasos* were honored for, among other things, having given "burial money" for deceased individuals, κατ[ὰ τὸν νόμον].[117] The cult of the Megaloi Theoi had a *nomophylax*. Epimeletai of a Bendis cult on Salamis were honored because they supervised the sacrifices, ὡς αὐτοῖς πάτριόν ἐστι and supervised the "other things" which αὐτοῖς ὁ

113 On this text see Mikalson, 1998.142 and Arnaoutoglou, 2003.97–8 and 103. The bibliography on the cult of Bendis in Athens is immense, but most useful for my purposes are Wijma, 2014.126–55, Jones, 1999.256–62, Mikalson, 1998.140–2, Parker, 1996.170–5 and 337–8, Garland, 1992.111–14, and Simms, 1988.59–76.

114 As in *IG* II^2 1284.24 of mid-III BC.

115 If the devotees are referring to *IG* I^3 136, it was in fact a *psephisma* and not a *nomos*.

116 *IG* II^2 1326.14–15, 21–3, 29–31, 42–4 of 176/5.

117 *IG* II^2 1278.2–4.

νόμος προστάττει.[118] The sacrifices are controlled by τὰ πάτρια, their other activities by *nomoi*.[119]

The members of cult associations passed numerous *psephismata* honoring their members for one service or another. For our purposes more important are those *psephismata* controlling cult activities. The private cult of the Mother of the Gods was one of the longest lasting such associations in Athens.[120] *IG* II^2 1328 of 183/2, in response to a complaint by the priestesses of expenses they faced, describes for them some duties such as spreading two couches and providing jewelry for the *phialophoroi* and other women and also makes an extraordinary appointment of a *zakoros*. And, finally, in the early third century a *koinon* worshipping both Heroines and Echelos had their ἀρχαῖα ψη[φίσματα] which laid out orders for sacrifices to these deities, the victims, the costs, and the distribution of the portions.[121]

Nomoi and *psephismata* of private *koina* seem differentiated like those of the polis, with *nomoi* establishing the basic principles—almost like a charter—for the cult but with *psephismata* used for more ephemeral matters and for honoring members of the *koinon*.[122] And *koina*, unlike the polis, were more regularly remodeling their cults by legislation throughout our period.

---

118 Zeus Labraundos, *IG* II^2 1271.16–18 of 299/8; Artemis, *IG* II^2 1298.16–20 of 248/7; Megaloi Theoi, *Agora* 16.324.6 of 112/1; cult of Bendis, *SEG* 59.155.3–5 of 243/2 and 44.60.3–5 of 244/3. Cf. *IG* II^2 1291.5–6.

119 [τὰ ν]ομιζόμενα of *SEG* 29.135.7 and τὰ νόμιμα of *IG* II^2 1277.8 should not be considered *nomoi*. In the latter case, τὰ νόμιμα are paired with τὰ πάτρια as they are in *IG* II^2 1134.35 from Delphi.

120 On this cult see Mikalson, 1998.203–4.

121 *Agora* 16.161. On this cult and text, see Mikalson, 1998.147–8.

122 Cf. Arnaoutoglou, 2003,128–9: "Therefore, *nomos* in the context of Athenian associations could be better understood as a set of rules applied to all members, without distinction, regulating common activities, while *psephisma* denotes any decision of the assembly of the members, which concerns individuals. *Nomos* has nothing to do with constitution, if that term includes the founding act of an association."

CHAPTER 8

Oracles and Divination

We have thus far considered the role of τὰ πάτρια, *nomoi*, and *psephismata* as authorities in the structure of Athenian religion, and here we investigate oracles and divination as another such authority. Bowden (2005.168–9) offers a most convenient "Concordance of Athenian consultations of Delphi," in which he lists 28 occurrences with the appropriate references. Bowden treats only classical Athens and only Delphi, and his latest oracle is from 330 BC. From these we select, for our purposes, those concerning religious matters, and we add examples from other oracles and from other forms of divination to the end of the Hellenistic period.[1]

New and Renewed Cults and Religious Events

The *Ath. Pol.* (21.6) records that for Cleisthenes the Delphic Oracle selected the ten new eponymous heroes of the new ten tribes from one hundred preselected "founding heroes" (ἀρχηγετῶν), presumably in 508/7. This transformation of the cult of ten heroes into eponymous heroes was not exactly the introduction of new cults, but it was a major innovation, in that each selected hero would now be worshipped by a different group for different purposes, even though the cult site and presumably the family of the priest would remain the same.

In the years just before the Persian Wars, as the Athenians planned to attack Aegina, they received an oracle from Delphi bidding them to wait thirty years, then in the thirty-first year to build a sanctuary for the Aeginetan hero Aeacus and begin the war against the Aeginetans. If they did this,

> what they wished would come to them. But if they campaigned immediately, they would suffer much in the interval and would also accomplish much, and in the end would overthrow the Aeginetans. When the Athenians heard this report, they built a sanctuary for Aeacus, the sanctuary that still stands in the Agora, but they did not put up with hearing that they had to wait thirty years after they had suffered wrongs from the Aeginetans. (Herodotus 5.89.2–3)

1 On the use of oracles, and especially the Delphic oracle, by Greek poleis, see Bonnechere, 2013 and Parker, 1985.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_011

The Athenians subdued Aegina in 457/6, and if one assumes that the Delphic oracle proved completely accurate, that Athens would take Aegina in a war beginning in the thirty-first year, the oracle must have been given after the battle of Marathon (490), not before as Herodotus has it. But the evidence clearly indicates that these events occurred in the period between 507 and 499, and so the oracle is correct in the outcome but not in the timing of the end of the Athenian-Aeginetan hostilities.[2] For our purposes the salient point is that the cult of Aeacus in Athens was established just before the Persian Wars as a result of the Delphic Oracle.

According to the emperor Julian (5.159b), the Athenians were ordered by the Pythia to appease the wrath of the Mother of the Gods over her priest who had been expelled or murdered by some Athenians. To do this the Athenians erected in the Agora the Metroön, the building or, perhaps better, the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods where the Athenian archives were kept. The oracle, if genuine, would be establishing in central Athens a new cult of the Mother of the Gods, perhaps about 500 BC.[3]

Pausanias (1.32.5) tells the story of the founding of the hero cult of Echetlaios after the battle of Marathon:

> The Marathonians say there was a man in the battle who was rustic in his appearance and gear. He killed many of the barbarians with a plow, and then disappeared. When the Athenians questioned Delphi, the god responded nothing else to them but bid them to honor Echetlaios as a hero.

In the *psephisma* of *IG* I^3 7 of ca. 460–450 the polis is granting the request of the Praxiergidae for a public record of τὰ πάτρια of their *genos* concerning, apparently, the Plynteria and Kallynteria. The *stele* records two things: the oracle of the god, no doubt Apollo, and the previous *psephismata* on the subject. We have both an oracle, certainly prior and perhaps going back to early days of the Praxiergidae's activities, and *psephismata* establishing for the family its πάτρια, its now ancestral responsibilities for this ritual.[4]

---

2 Mikalson, 2003.23. On the cult of Aeacus on Aegina and in Athens and on the Anakeion in Athens, see Stroud, 1998, esp. 85–104.

3 On this oracle, the other sources for the event, and the date, see Parker, 1996.188–91 and Fontenrose, 1978.312–13.

4 On the Praxiergidae, the Plynteria and Kallynteria, and this text, and for a different interpretation of the relationship of the oracle and τὰ πάτρια, see Parker, 1996.307–8 and 2005.474–5 and 478–9.

IG I^3 40.64–9 of 446/5 records sacrifices "from the oracles concerning Euboea," to be performed by three bouleutai with the chresmologue Hierocles and to be supervised by the strategoi. These sacrifices were probably made on Euboea and were a one-time event. Hierocles, given his profession, may have interpreted old oracles.[5]

IG I^3 256 of ca. 440–430 records fees and fines for use or misuse of the rural spring of Alochos, obviously in a sanctuary of the Nymphs. It begins, however, with a command "to sacrifice to the Nymphs according to the oracle from Pytho" (2–4). Here it is likely that the oracle went back to the founding of the sanctuary.[6]

Several, perhaps all, of the prescriptions for the cult of Bendis in a *psephisma* of 413/2 (?) were based on an oracle. Another oracle, from Dodona and no doubt earlier than that of *IG* I^3 136, had probably approved granting the cult ἔγκτησις and ἵδρυσις, that is, the founding of the cult for Thacians resident in Athens.[7]

According to the scholiast on the passage, the cult of Hermes Hegemonios first mentioned in Aristophanes, *Ploutos* 1159, was founded because of an oracle.[8]

In his speech against Meidias of 347/6 Demosthenes, in the context of the City Dionysia, says that the Athenians make all their choruses and hymns for the god "not only according to the *nomoi* but also according to the oracles (κατὰ τὰς μαντείας)." In these oracles, he continues, the city was bid by both Delphi and Dodona to establish choruses κατὰ τὰ πάτρια and to fill the streets with the savor of sacrifices and to wear crowns (21.51). He then had some oracles read (52–53), oracles which are not all genuine in the text as we have it.[9] In summarizing the oracles (54–5), which no doubt long predated the speech, Demosthenes claims that there are these and many other oracles for the city, and that they order the Athenians to sacrifice the other sacrifices to the gods appearing in each oracle and to establish choruses and to wear crowns κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. He adds, apparently, that these oracles are in addition to all the others that come to the city.[10] The oracles, if Demosthenes is exact in his wording

5 On Hierocles and this text, see Parker, 2005.112–13 and M&L #52.

6 This text should be added to the "historical" oracles of Fontenrose, 1978.

7 *IG* I^3 136.7 and 31 and *IG* II^2 1283.4–6. For more on these oracles and the interplay with other authorities, see below, pp. 178–180.

8 On which see Mikalson, 1998.37–8 and Parker, 1996.238.

9 See Appendix 1.

10 An awkwardly added clause that adds little except, perhaps, to establish the general validity of oracles.

here, seem to be *reestablishing* τὰ πάτρια, and if that is the case, the most likely time for the oracles is during the Pisistratid remodeling of the City Dionysia in VI BC. If we parse Demosthenes' text a little less closely, he may just be emphasizing that the choruses and such things both are ordered by oracles and are τὰ πάτρια as they are also κατὰ τοὺς νόμους.[11]

We must now leap over more than 200 years to when, from the Delphians' point of view, the Athenian Demos voted in a *psephisma* (in 138) to send a Pythaïs to Delphi, "following the oracles and the 'historical inquiries' (ἱστορίαις)."[12] This was a restoration of the *theoria* last held in 326/5.[13] For the Pythaïs of 98/7 the authorities include the oracle of the god and the *psephisma*, but to them are added τὰ [πάτρια].[14] It is likely that the oracle of Apollo goes back to the establishment of the original Pythaïdes in the fifth century,[15] and that the *psephismata* deal with the current celebrations. Again, the ultimate authority behind this religious event would be the oracle.[16]

---

11 *SEG* 25.140.7 of the first half of IV BC has been restored to make the sacrifices to Poseidon and Erechtheus κα[τὰ τὴν μαντείαν] as well as [κατὰ τὰ] πάτρια.

12 *FD* 3.2.27.4–7. Cf. 3.2.48.7–8 of 98/7 and 2.50.3–4 of 106 or 97 BC ἱστορίαις, to judge from the parallel in Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.70, suggests that the restoration of the Pythaïs after nearly 200 years required some historical study, perhaps of the works of the Atthidographers. It may well have been, in our terms, a search of τὰ πάτρια. It is unparalleled in a similar context in Athenian inscriptions. For the Athenian contributors to the Pythaïdes, see *SEG* 32.218.

13 On the Pythaïdes and their restoration at this time, see Jim, 2014.240–3, Rutherford, 2013, esp. 176–7, 183–5, 222–30, 306–7, and 310–13, Deshours, 2011.97–104, Parker, 2005.82–7, Mikalson, 1998.34 and 268–72, and Tracy, 1982. The purpose of them was "to offer homage to Apollo with sacrifices and games, to present the traditional 'first fruits,' and to bring the symbolic sacred fire from Delphi to Athens" (Tracy, 152). The purpose expressed in *FD* 3.2.48.9 (as stated by the Delphians concerning the Athenians) is "for the health and safety of all the citizens, their children and wives, friends and allies." Once reestablished in 138/7 they were held again in 128/7, 106/5, 103/2, 102/1, 101/0, 100/99, 99/8, and 98/7 (Deshours, 2011.97).

14 *FD* 3.2.48.7–8.

15 For which see Strabo, 9.2.11 and Parker, 2005.85.

16 Most would include the Telemachus monument (*SEG* 47.232) among oracular establishments of new cults. There is, however, much troubling about the critical lines 11–16 which are taken to indicate oracular approval for the introduction of the Asclepius cult to Athens in 420/19. The "oracles" themselves are almost completely restored (κα[τὰ χρησμ]ός), and to what they refer, if there, is also difficult. It is hard to imagine that the god's name (Asclepius) was omitted in line 13 by accident, as most assume. If not, the presumed oracles would concern bringing the "servants," if, again, this is the correct restoration, on a chariot, again a restoration. Despite the widely held assumptions about the restorations and meanings of these lines, we need, I think, to be more wary of this text. The very

In *SEG* 21.469C of 129/8 a number of cults of Apollo are refurbished and expanded. In the section on Apollo Patroös it is claimed that Apollo through oracles ordered the Athenians to "entreat" (λ[ι]ταν[εῦσ]α[ι]) the god called Patroös and to make the [πατρί]ου[ς θυσί]ας at the appropriate times of the year to Apollo (11–14). Timarchos of Sphettos, tamias of the Boule, "renewed" or "revived" (ἀνενώσατο) the oracles and the existing honors for the god. The Boule and Ekklesia then plan not only to preserve τὰ πάτρια but also to increase the sacrifices and honors καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς. They will do the other things for Apollo according to the oracles, and various officials will make sacrifices in addition to "the things voted by *psephismata* before" (15–26). Here it looks as though Delphi is reacting to Athens' neglect of Apollo Patroös (hence λιτανεῦσαι) and had repeatedly ordered the renewal of the ancestral sacrifices to him.[17] This neglect must have been well before 129/8 because Timarchos had to "revive" these oracles. Now the polis is responding not only by restoring the traditional τίμια of the god, presumably established by *psephismata*, but also, by this *psephisma*, is increasing the τίμια.

Elements Added to Existing Cults

Diogenes Laertius (1.110) in his life of Epimenides tells the following story:

> When the Athenians were beset by a plague, the Pythia gave them an oracle to purify the city. They sent a ship and Nicias, the son of Niceratus, to Crete, summoning Epimenides. He came in the 46th Olympiad (595–592) and purified their city and stopped the plague in the following way. He took black and white sheep and led them to the Areopagus. From there he let them go wherever they wished, and ordered those who followed them to sacrifice each one, where it lay down, to the appropriate god. As a result it is possible even now to find throughout the demes of the Athenians altars with no names on them, a memorial of the propitiation (of the gods) that took place then.

If we wish to understand Epimenides' procedure, we may imagine that he wished to appease only the specific gods that were responsible for the plague,

---

fragmentary *IG* I^3 137 of ca. 420 appears to be establishing or enhancing a cult of Apollo, perhaps as the ancestral exegetes, on the basis of Apollo's own oracle.

17 This is the only example of λιτάνω on Attic inscriptions, and it is very rare on those from other places.

and that the victims themselves were to indicate the appropriate gods by lying down in their sanctuaries. Their sacrifice was then the propitiation of these gods. Our interest is not the ending of the plague,[18] but, as before, in new cults or additions or changes to them from oracles. Here it looks as though a series of altars, unusually with no gods' names on them, were constructed in existing sanctuaries of various gods to mark their role in the stopping of the plague. Apollo's role here is, as it were, secondary. He motivated the Athenians to make a purification and perhaps specified Epimenides—although this is not attested—, and Epimenides dictated the procedures. From Plutarch (*Solon* 12.5) it would appear the pollution was associated with the killing of the Cylonian conspirators, and that the altars were constructed at Epimenides' direction.[19] In Diogenes' view the new altars, as so many innovations in cult, were a ὑπόμνημα of an important event.

Plutarch twice (*Theseus* 36.1–3 and *Cimon* 8.6) describes how, in 476/5, the Pythia gave an oracle to the Athenians to recover the bones of Theseus, to bury them with honor and guard them in their own land, and to honor him as a hero.[20] Theseus had been murdered on the island of Scyros about 400 years before, and Cimon, the son of Miltiades, led the successful expedition to recover the bones. When the bones were returned to Athens, "The Athenians, delighted, received them with brilliant *pompai* and with sacrifices as if the hero himself were returning to the city. . . . And they make to him the greatest sacrifice on Pyanopsion 8 . . ., and they honor him also on the eighth day of each month" (*Theseus* 36.2–3). It is almost inconceivable that the Athenians had not had a sanctuary and cult of Theseus before 476/5,[21] and so we may view this as a major enhancement to his cult, an enhancement reflected in his burgeoning popularity in this period.

I. Eleusis 28a, the famous First Fruits Decree of ca. 440–435, orders that the Athenians make an *aparche* of their harvest of wheat and barley to the goddesses κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὲν μαντείαν τὲν ἐγ Δελφῶν (4–5). It is unlikely that

18 For this type of purification being required for the pollution and plague resulting from the Cylonian affair, see the sources, often contradictory, collected in Sandys, 1912.1–3. Given the circumstances of the case, it was appropriate that the victims were released at the Areopagus.

19 ἱλασμοῖς τισι καὶ καθαρμοῖς καὶ ἱδρύσεσι κατοργιάσας καὶ καθοφιώσας τὴν πόλιν. On Epimenides see Parker, 1983.211 n. 23 and Jacoby on *FGrHist* 457.

20 Pausanias (3.3.7) has the Delphic Oracle make the recovery of the bones of Theseus a precondition to the capture of Scyrus.

21 On this event and the earlier and later cult of Theseus in Athens, see Parker, 1996.168–70 and Shapiro, 1996. For serious doubts about Plutarch's account and on Theseus in Athens in general, see Zaccarini, 2015.

the specific amounts (1/600 of all barley, 1/1200 of all wheat) and the collection mechanism then described belong to the oracle. The same oracle, perhaps simply "to make an *aparche* of the harvest to the two goddesses," was then twice more referred to, by the hierophant and the dadouchos when they are to urge that all Greeks do the same (24–6) and when the Boule was to request this of the cities (33–4). Isocrates in his *Panegyricus* of 380 describes this same *aparche*, but gives a different account of the oracle (4.31):

> Most cities as a remembrance of our good service long ago send *aparchai* of grain to us each year, and the Pythia ordered those failing in this to send parts of their crops and to do τὰ πάτρια regarding our city. Yet, about what ought one more to believe than those things about which the god gives a reply and which seem right to many of the Greeks?

If we combine *I. Eleusis* 28a and Isocrates 4.31, we have two oracles from Delphi. The first orders the *aparche* to Demeter and Kore, probably just for the Athenians. In *I. Eleusis* 28a the Athenians attempt to extend this mandate to allied and other Greek cities, implying but not expressly stating a Delphic oracle to this effect. Isocrates indicates a second, later oracle spurring on the laggard cities. Given the nature of the two sources, it seems likely that Isocrates, in promoting and defending Athens about 60 years later, misremembers or misrepresents the situation for an international audience and has made the oracle of *I. Eleusis* 28a refer to laggard cities and thereby support Athenian expansion of the original Delphic mandate to all Greek cities.[22]

Pausanias (1.3.4) describes a statue of Apollo Alexikakos by Calamis, erected in front of the temple of Apollo Patroös in the Agora. The god received this epithet because, by an oracle from Delphi, he stopped the plague afflicting

22 Clinton (1974.15 n. 26) thinks Delphi bid all Greek cities to make the *aparche* to Eleusis: "Delphi was probably consulted on this occasion of the extension [of the *aparche* to allied and other cities], or at the time it was first extended if this is not the first time. . . ." That Delphi would order such a thing seems unlikely, as well that it would order other Greeks to act κατὰ τὰ πάτρια of the Athenians. On the results of this decree in terms of contributions by Athenians and other cities, and that Isocrates' statement that "most cities . . . send *aparchai* of grain to us each year" is "probably not a falsehood, but just an exaggeration," see Clinton, 2010. On the *aparche* to Eleusis in general, see also Jim, 2014.207–19.

From the very fragmentary *I. Eleusis* 138 of mid-IV BC it would appear (A10) that an oracle (κατὰ τὴν μαντείαν) had something to do with the declaration of the sacred truce for the Eleusinian Mysteries. On this see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.119: "Reference to the Delphic Oracle probably indicates an innovation, sanctioned by Apollo either at this time or earlier."

Athens at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. This looks not to be a new cult but simply a dedication given to the existing cult of Apollo Patroös. It was probably for this cult that Neoptolemus was honored, in a *psephisma* proposed by Lycurgus, for having promised to gild the new altar of Apollo "in accordance with the prophecy of the god," surely Apollo of Delphi ([Plut.] *X Orat.* 843F–844A).[23]

In the mid-fourth century the Acharnians decided to build an altar (2–3) or, more likely, altars (7, 14–15) for Ares and Athena Areia, "since the god responded that it was λῶιον καὶ ἄμεινον ("better") for the Demos of Acharnians and the Demos of Athenians having built the altars of Ares and Athena Areia "so that the things relating to the gods may be εὐσ[ε]βῶς for Acharnians and Athenians" (*SEG* 21.519. 4–10). The purpose given is the clearest statement we have of why one would consult an oracle on such a matter—to establish that the proposed action was εὐσεβές.

IG II^3 445 of ca. 335 contains provisions for the cult equipment (κόσμος) of numerous deities, and lines 43–50 treat especially that of Artemis Brauronia and of Demeter and Kore. Here the god is to be asked if it is λῶον καὶ ἄμεινον for the Demos of Athenians having made the equipment sacred to these deities and others larger and more beautiful (μείζους καὶ καλλίους) or leaving it as it is. The god, no doubt Apollo, must approve this rather large scale remaking of the dedications to these deities.

Three texts, ranging from ca. 330–320 to mid-I BC describe the spreading of a couch and the adornment of a table for Plouton as being "according to the oracle of the god." This certainly refers to an addition to the cult at Eleusis, not its foundation.[24]

Management of Sanctuaries and Dedications

During his reign, after 546, Pisistratus in response to oracle(s) undertook the purification of a part of Delos, all that area of the island that could be viewed from the sanctuary. He had the corpses in tombs dug up and removed to another part of the island. In 426/5 the Athenians, probably in response to the plague, "on basis of some oracle," expanded the purification to include the whole island. Tombs were removed to neighboring Rhenea, and an order went out the no one was to die or give birth on the island. In 422 the Athenians,

23 On this event and the oracle, see Parker, 1996.245.

24 *IG* II^2 1933 of ca. 330–320; 1934 of 170–50 (for the date see Tracy, 1990.155–6 and Miles, 1998, #60); and 1935 of mid-I BC.

"believing that for some old cause the Delians were not pure and that this element of their purification was lacking," expelled the Delians themselves from their island. The next year the Athenians, taking to heart their misfortunes in battle and because the god in Delphi gave them an oracle to do so, restored the Delians to Delos.[25]

IG II^3 292 of 352/1 offers a remarkably detailed description of one method of consulting Delphi, here on the question of whether on a piece of land on the boundary of Athens and Megara it was [λῶιον καὶ ἄμεινο]ν for the Demos of Athenians to contract out currently farmed land of the new defined *hiera orgas* of Demeter and Kore or to leave this land unworked (28–30). The purpose of the inquiry is "so that τὰ πρὸς τὼ θεω may be as εὐσεβῆ as possible and so that for the future nothing ἀσεβές may happen concerning the *hiera orgas* and concerning the other sanctuaries at Athens" (51–4).[26]

In the mid-fourth century "the god," surely Apollo, responded to the Demos of Athenians to dedicate the house and garden of Demon, son of Demomeles, of the deme Paiania to Asclepius and to make him priest of the cult. And so it was done, κατὰ τὴν μαν[τείαν], and, apparently, was a break from the usual system of appointing the priest of this cult.[27]

In 330–324 Hyperides (4.24–6) reports an oracle from Zeus of Dodona to the Athenians. Zeus "ordered" (προσέταξεν) the Athenians to "adorn" the statue of Dione at Dodona. The Athenians sent a religious embassy to Dodona, performed an expensive sacrifice, and, as ordered, "adorned" the statue of Dione. They made her face "as beautiful as possible," and they prepared much expensive "ornament" (κόσμον) for the goddess. That is, probably, they provided jewelry for the goddess' head.[28]

When Philip II restored Oropus to Athens in 335, the Athenians decided to divide the acquired public lands among the ten tribes, with pairs of tribes receiving allotments.[29] After the division had been made and some incomes received, the concern arose whether one of the parcels was in fact sacred

---

25 Hdt. 1.64.2, Thuc. 3.104.1–2 and 5.1.1 and 32.1, and Diod. S. 12.28.6–7. As Bowden (2005.113) suggests, "The Athenians must finally have turned to Delphi and asked whether it was better and more profitable for the city of Athens to restore the Delians to Delos." For possible religious and perhaps military motives for the expulsion and restoration of the Delians, see Hornblower, 1991–2008 on the passages cited.

26 [ὅπ]ω[ς] ἄ[ν] ὡς εὐσεβέστατα ἔχει τὰ πρὸς τὼ θεὼ [καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς τὸν λοιπ]ὸ[ν] χρόνον μηδὲν ἀσεβὲς γίγνητ[αι περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς] ὀ[ργάδος καὶ] περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν τῶν Ἀθ[ήνησιν].

27 *IG* II^2 4949. See Blok and Lambert, 2009.98.

28 On this event, see Parker, 2005.87–8 and Whitehead, 2000.223–7.

29 On this matter and on the divination involved, see Parke, 1967.142–3.

to Amphiaraus. It was decided to have three citizens sleep in the temple of Amphiaraus to receive divine instruction. Euxenippus, one of the three, reported a dream that apparently favored the tribes' claims over Amphiaraus'.[30]

Others

In describing statues of Zeus at Olympia, Pausanias (5.21.5–6) records the inscriptions on six of them, to the effect that Delphic Apollo ordered the Athenians, who were refusing to pay a fine imposed on one of their citizens who had bribed his opponents in the games of 332/1, to pay the fine. Apollo said he would not give Athenians oracular responses until they paid the fine. The Athenians paid the fine, and from it were made the six statues of Zeus.

Of the four oracles given in Demosthenes 21.52–3, one appears genuine. Zeus of Dodona orders the Athenians, because they have missed times of sacrifice and of the *heorte* at Dodona, to make sacrifices and dedicate a bronze table to Zeus Naios and Dione.[31]

Summary of Oracles and Divination

New and Renewed Cults and Religious Events

Selection of eponymous heroes, Apollo, ca. 508/7
Cult of Aeacus, Apollo, 507–487
Cult of Mother of the Gods, ca. 500, Apollo
Cult of Echetlaios, ca. 490, Apollo
Plynteria and Kallynteria, long (?) before 460–50, Apollo (?)
Sacrifices "from the oracles concerning Euboea," 446/5
Cult of Nymphs, before 440–30, Apollo
Cult of Bendis, before 413/2 (?), Zeus
New cult of Hermes Hegemonios, before 388/7
City Dionysia, before 347/6
Pythaïs, V BC (?), Apollo
Sacrifices to Apollo Patroös, long before 129/8, Apollo

30 The source is Hyperides 4. For more on this, see below, pp. 180–1.

31 See Appendix I, Oracle IV.

Additions to Existing Cults

New altars in existing cults, 595–593, Apollo
Cult of Theseus, 476/5, Apollo
Aparche to Demeter and Kore, Apollo, before 440–435
Statue for Apollo Patroös, ca. 430–425, Apollo
Altars for Ares and Athena Areia, mid-IV BC, Apollo (?)
Kosmos for various deities, ca. 335, Apollo
Gilding of new altar of Apollo, ca. 330, Apollo
Adornment of table for Plouton, before 330–320, Apollo (?)

Management of Sanctuaries and Dedications

Concerning Delos:
- After 546, Pisistratus purified a part of Delos, in response to oracle(s)
- In 426/5, the Athenians, "on basis of some oracle," expanded the purification to include the whole island
- In 421, after expelling them in 422, the Athenians returned the Delians to their island, based on an oracle from Delphi

Use of *hiera orgas* of Demeter and Kore, 352/1, Apollo
Dedication of house and garden to Asclepius, mid-IV BC, Apollo (?)
Adornment of statue of Dione at Dodona, 330–324, Zeus
Sacred Truce for Mysteries, mid-IV BC, Apollo (?)
Land in Oropus, sacred or not, 330–324, Amphiaraus

Others

Requiring Athenians to pay Olympic fine, 332/1, Apollo
Requiring of Athenians, as punishment for missing times of sacrifice, sacrifices and a dedication, Zeus of Dodona

CHAPTER 9

The Four Authorities

In an important paper of 2009 entitled "The Dynamics of Ritual Norms in Greek Cult," Angelos Chaniotis offers, with examples from inscriptions from six cities, five of them Hellenistic, what he terms "a 'stratigraphic' analysis of cult regulations." In these texts he distinguishes among the "authorities" we have found in the Athenian texts, τὰ πάτρια, *nomoi*, and *psephismata*, and has much of value to say of each. In general outline, τὰ πάτρια "made up the central core of ritual practices; τὰ πάτρια did not have recognisable authors; their mortal agent was an abstract collective: the ancestors." The *nomos* "contained specific instructions concerning the application of τὰ πάτρια and the penalties for those who violated them." The *nomos* "existed in writing and was the result of recognisable human agents." And the *psephisma*, "the decree of the Ekklesia which simply took measures for the enforcement of τὰ πάτρια; the decree had an author . . .; it was subject to discussion in the Boule . . . and in the Ekklesia; and in theory it was subject to negotiation and modification."[1] Chaniotis only briefly treats oracles which I mark out as a separate authority, but his general outline offers an excellent introduction as we look to the Athenian texts.

In Chapters 6–8 we surveyed the roles of τὰ πάτρια, *nomoi, psephismata*, and oracles in determining specific matters in a number of religious areas, including sacrifices, *heortai*, sanctuaries, etc. as they appear in both literary and epigraphical texts. We now offer discussions of each and, using specific examples, attempt to describe the interplay of these four types of authority in Athenian cultic activity, both public and private.

τὰ πάτρια[2]

IG II^2 1496 of 334/3–331/0 records the revenues the polis received during the period from the sale of skins of victims at polis-supported *heortai* and

1 P. 98. In these quotations I have modified certain terms to match my terminology: e.g., τὰ πάτρια for "the *patria*," "Ekklesia" for "assembly" and "Boule" for "council." Chaniotis offers a fuller description of these elements on pp. 102–3.

2 Deshours (304–7) has a good discussion of τὰ πάτρια in the context of the late Hellenistic period and of the revival of so many traditional religious cults and *heortai* in that time. See also Stavrianopoulou, 2011, Chaniotis, 2009, and Garland, 1992.23–5.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_012

sacrifices. There are nine *heortai* and six sacrifices listed. It may be that this inscription records all the polis-supported sacrifices and *heortai* of the time that required a substantial number of victims. The sacrifices, as distinct from the *heortai*, are to deities whose cults were all seemingly established in the fourth century or the very end of the fifth: Agathe Tyche (by 335/4), Ammon (by 340–330),[3] Demokratia (perhaps 403), Eirene (in 375/4), Hermes Hegemonios (by 388/7), and Zeus Soter of Piraeus (by 388). None of these, interestingly, occurs in our lists of τὰ πάτρια. The *heortai*, all older, are the Asclepieia (420/19), Bendideia (late V BC), City Dionysia, Dionysia in Piraeus, Eleusinia, Lenaia, Olympieia, Panathenaia, and Theseia (by 476/5). Of these major *heortai* the City Dionysia, Panathenaia, and Theseia are among τὰ πάτρια, and it may be chance that some of the others do not turn up as such in our texts. Also, most sacrifices and *heortai* associated with τὰ πάτρια did not require large numbers of victims and hence were not recorded in *IG* II^2 1496. But the distribution of entries supports the distinction I offered some years ago (1998.36), that the *heortai* are all of long standing while most if not all of the sacrifices seem innovations of the fourth century. Therefore only the relatively old *heortai* are controlled by τὰ πάτρια.[4]

The sacrifices, as distinct from the *heortai*, listed in *IG* II^2 1496 can, perhaps, be classed as ἐπίθετα, "things added on." The purpose of the *psephisma* of *SEG* 21.469C.17–20 of 129/8 is "that the boule and Demos may appear not only observing τὰ πάτρια but also increasing the sacrifices and the honors καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς. . . ." It distinguishes between "observing" (διοτηροῦντες) τὰ πάτρια and "increasing" the sacrifices and honors for Apollo.[5] In other parlance, the increased sacrifices and honors would be called, in distinction from τὰ πάτρια,

3 If *SEG* 46.122 of 363/2 is, as it now seems to be, an inventory of gifts sent by Athens on a *theoria* to Siwa, not an inventory of a local cult.

4 Rosivach, 1994.48–67 offers much of value on these questions, but here and in what follows I disagree with his distinction between events that are πάτρια and ἐπίθετα. He sees the fundamental difference in funding, with τὰ ἐπίθετα receiving polis general funds and with τὰ πάτρια receiving funding from the mysterious μισθώματα of Isoc. 7.29. The import of Isoc. 7.29 is not this, however. Whether μισθώματα are "contracts" or "rents" does not much matter. Rather it should be seen as sarcastic and derogatory, with Isocrates complaining that τὰ ἐπίθετα with their banquets receive lots of state funds but τὰ πάτρια get only miniscule funds. Similarly some Americans have suggested that the school budgets should get full state funding and shortfalls in the military budget should be covered by bake sales. The source of funding is not the fundamental difference between τὰ πάτρια and τὰ ἐπιθέτα.

5 By "honors" here is probably meant hymns, *pompai, agones*, and such things. See Mikalson, 2010.160.

Cf. Lycurg. *Leoc*. 1–2.

τὰ ἐπίθετα, "the added things." In *Ath. Pol.* 3.3 it is reported, as we have seen, that the basileus and polemarch "administer" τὰ πάτρια, the archon τὰ ἐπίθετα. In the *Areopagiticus* Isocrates praises Athenians of olden days who would do away with no one of τὰ πάτρια and would add nothing outside τὰ νομιζόμενα. They would not, "whenever it seemed right to them, send in *pompe* 300 cows nor would they, whenever they just happened to, abandon the πάτριοι θυσίαι" (7.29–30). Things outside τὰ νομιζόμενα would be τὰ ἐπίθετα. So Isocrates can distinguish between the πάτριοι θυσίαι and the ἐπίθετοι ἑορταί (7.29).[6] And the phrase ὁπότε . . . δόξειεν αὐτοῖς ("whenever it seemed right to them") suggests that the procedures for creating τὰ ἐπίθετα were *nomoi* and *psephismata*.

The distinction between τὰ πάτρια and τὰ ἐπίθετα arises in the charges brought, about 399 BC, against Nicomachus who with others had been commissioned, among other things, to "write up" (ἀναγράφειν) the pre-existing laws and the polis sacrificial calendar (Lysias 30).[7] The purpose of the latter was to ensure that the city performed "the sacrifices from the *kyrbeis*" and those from the *stelai* (30.17). The *kyrbeis* were the inscriptions recording the sacrificial calendar ascribed to Solon, and the *stelai* were presumably the inscriptions recording sacrifices established since then by *nomoi* and *psephismata*.[8] We can be quite confident that the sacrifices from the *kyrbeis* were always considered πάτρια, but were the later sacrifices and *heortai*, those established by *nomoi* and *psephismata*, thought πάτρια or ἐπίθετα? Some people, the prosecutor claims, used to sacrifice only τὰ ἐκ τῶν κύρβεων (30.17). He himself says "it is necessary to sacrifice first the sacrifices κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, the sacrifices "which

6 On this passage and this distinction, see Garland, 1992.23–5.

7 On Solon's calendar and Nicomachus' "writing up" of it (*SEG* 52.48), see Canevaro and Harris, 2012.111–16; Stavrianopoulou, 2011.86–92, Shear, 2011.74–5, 78–96, 232, and 238–45; Carawan, 2010; Pébarthe, 2006.129–42; Lambert, 2002; Parker, 1996.43–55 and 218–20; Todd, 1996; Rhodes, 1991; Robertson, 1990; and Clinton, 1982. On the speech see also Todd, 2000.296–307 and Edwards, 1999.154–74. The problems concerning what Nicomachus was charged to do and what he did do and the relationship of that to the fragments of the State Calendar are legion but, fortunately, for our purposes do not need to be addressed. For a good summary of the current concerns, see Carawan, 2010.

8 On this see Lambert, 2002.354 and 357. I follow here the common reading and interpretation of the text (e.g., Rhodes, 1991), but note Nelson's (2006) conjecture of οὐ πλείω for the commonly accepted conjecture τῶν στηλῶν which would change significantly many conclusions drawn from the passage. For these changes and the common opinion, see Nelson, 2006.310–11. With Nelson's conjecture the link of τὰ πάτρια and ἐκ τῶν κύρβεων would remain, however, and would be even more exclusive.

more are beneficial to the polis,"[9] then the sacrifices "which the Demos voted" (19)." Here the two groups are, apparently: 1) the sacrifices "from the *kyrbeis*" which are sacrificed κατὰ τὰ πάτρια; and 2) sacrifices resulting from *psephismata* of the Demos. The phrase "which more are beneficial to the polis" reflects the importance of the first group vis-à-vis the second, an importance suggested elsewhere by the speaker. Of particular importance to us is that the speaker links the sacrifices "from the *kyrbeis*" to τὰ πάτρια.[10] So far it seems possible that only the sacrifices "from the *kyrbeis*" were thought πάτρια, but we leave the question open as we next look at which sacrifices and *heortai* are termed πάτρια in our epigraphical texts and elsewhere.

τὰ πάτρια Likely from the Solonian Calendar

Very closely linked to τὰ πάτρια at Athens is the basileus.[11] We have seen that Philippides in 293/2, as basileus, sacrificed the sacrifices that fell to him εὐσ[ε]βῶς καὶ κα[τ]ὰ τὰ π[ά]τρια. The *Ath. Pol.* (57.1) reports that the basileus administered, so to speak, "all the πάτριοι θυσίαι."[12] According to the stranger in Plato's *Politicus* (290e6–8), to the basileus have been given "the most revered and especially πάτρια of the old sacrifices."[13] It was his wife who, according to [Demosthenes] (59.73 and 75) "did on behalf of the city τὰ πάτρια τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς." It was also by his *nomos* that at least some of the activities of the

9 ἃ μᾶλλον συμφέρει τῇ πόλει. I accept Bergk's deletion of ἔπειτα in this passage. The deletion creates two balanced groups instead of three unbalanced ones. The problems with keeping the ἔπειτα are apparent in Todd's (2000.303) translation of the passage: "our sacrifices should be, first, in the manner of our ancestors; secondly, in the best interests of the city; and thirdly, the ones that the democracy has decreed." What can the second group, "which are in the best interests of the city," be? Rosivach's suggestions (1994.55 n. 114) raise the problem more than offer a solution: "The middle term may refer to special *ad hoc* sacrifices, or it may refer to nothing in particular and was simply added to make the *epithetoi heortai*, which follow, appear superfluous and wasteful." The "middle group" creates a problem also for Stravrianopoulou's argument (2011.88 and 91). For a discussion, see Rauchenstein, 1872, *ad loc*.

10 In 30.20 αἱ πάτριοι θύσιαι also have an implied connection with τῶν ἐν ταῖς κύρβεσι γεγραμμένων. Given the context, τὰ πάτρια of 30.29 need not refer only to sacrifices but to everying, including the *nomoi*, that Nicomachus was charged with "writing up."

11 On the following religious activities of the basileus, see Carlier, 1984.329–37.

12 Cf. Polemon, 8.90.

13 τὰ σεμνότατα καὶ μάλιστα πάτρια τῶν ἀρχαίων θυσιῶν.

parasitoi of Heracles, activities that were to be κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, were governed.[14] And, as we have seen before (*Ath. Pol.* 57.1), he was especially concerned with the Eleusinian Mysteries, and [Lysias] 6.4, in its attack on Andocides, offers a valuable link between the basileus and τὰ πάτρια there: "If (Andocides) comes to be allotted as one of the nine archons and if he obtains the role of basileus, will he sacrifice on your behalf and pray κατὰ τὰ πάτρια,[15] those in the Eleusinion and those in the sanctuary at Eleusis, and will he supervise the *heorte* at the Mysteries, so that no one commits an injustice or shows lack of respect concerning the sacred things?"

The cult most controlled by τὰ πάτρια, to judge by our surviving evidence, was that of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis.[16] The Kerykes and Eumolpidae supervised the sanctuary there, and they with the epimeletai supervised also the Mysteries themselves, both κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[17] There were sacrifices to Demeter and Kore and the other gods οἷς πάτριον ἦν.[18] In [Dem.] 59.116 the hierophant Archias is charged with *asebeia* because he sacrificed παρὰ τὰ πάτρια (contrary to τὰ πάτρια). The *pompe* to Eleusis, the *pompe* of Iakchos, was to be held "as much as possible following τὰ πάτρια."[19] τὰ πάτρια governed the disposition of the garments of the initiates,[20] and, finally, the *aparchai* to Eleusis were to be made κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[21]

Theseus' bones were brought to Athens in 476/5 and a tomb, sacrifices, and a *heorte* were established (Plutarch, *Th.* 36.1–3 and *Cim.* 8.6). His cult in Athens almost certainly predated this event and dated back to Solonian times, and hence τὰ πάτρια associated with sacrifices in his cult may well refer to the sixth century BC.[22]

Various aspects of cults of other deities central to polis cult, and in all probability Solonian, were also controlled by τὰ πάτρια: Athena Polias, Erechtheus,

14 Philoch., *FGrHist* 328 F 73. Cf. Polemon, frag. 78. See Carlier, 1984.336–7.

15 Prayers κατὰ τὰ πάτρια are known for Athens only here. The πάτριοι εὐχαί of Aeschin. 1.23 are those of the herald at the opening of meetings of the Ekklesia, required by the nomothetes Solon.

16 On changes in this cult in the context of τὰ πάτρια, see Patera, 2011.

17 *Ath. Pol.* 39.2 and *I. Eleusis* 138.

18 *I. Eleusis* 192.13–14 and *IG* II^3 1164.14–15.

19 [ὡς μάλισ]τα τοῖς πατρίοις ἀκολουθῶς, *IG* II^3 1176.9–10. *I. Eleusis* 250.14–15 may also be relevant here.

20 Melanthius, *FGrHist* 326 F 4.

21 *I. Eleusis* 28a.4–5 and 25–6 and Isoc. 4.31.

22 *IG* II^2 956.6, 957.3–4. On Theseus' very likely presence in cult in Solon's time, see Shapiro, 1996. On the question, see now also Zaccarini, 2015.

Aglauros, Apollo Pythios and Patroös, Dionysus, and the Semnai.[23] Some rituals which seem very old, the Choes and the presentation of the *eirusione* to Apollo, are also done κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[24] We also tentatively include in the Solonian category the offerings to Apollo Prostaterios and Artemis Boulaia before meetings of the Ekklesia, widely attested as κατὰ τὰ πάτρια in the prytany decrees,[25] and to these we might add the sacrifices by the archons at the end of their terms on behalf of their successors (Lysias 26.8).

We note here further possible links of τὰ πάτρια to Solon. The *Ath. Pol.* (43.6) claims that, in two *ekklesiai* each month, the order of business was 1) "three of sacred things," 2) "three for the heralds and embassies," and 3) "three of secular matters."[26] Aeschines (1.23) refers to the first group as περὶ ἱερῶν τῶν πατρίων ("about sacred matters that were πάτρια"), and the lawgiver to whom Aeschines rightly or wrongly assigns the laws that control this and other matters in this speech is Solon (1.6).[27] We might also include in the agenda of the Ekklesia the opening prayers by the herald, prayers which were πάτριοι according to Aeschines (1.23) and were required by the nomothetes Solon.[28] And, finally, in its description of Cleisthenes' reforms, the *Ath. Pol.* (21.6) makes this claim: "He allowed them to have their *gene*, phratries, and priesthoods κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[29] Priesthoods predating Cleisthenes (Solonian?) we could, therefore, designate πάτριοι ἱερωσύναι.[30]

---

23 Athena Polias, *IG* I^3 7, II^2 776; Erechtheus, Dem. 60.27; Aglauros, *SEG* 33.115.14; Apollo Pythios, Dem.19.128; Apollo Patroös, *SEG* 21.469C; Dionysus, *IG* II^3 1284.10–11 and 35–6; and Semnai, *IG* II^3 1176.10.

24 Choes, Ar. *Ach*. 1000–1; *eirusione* to Apollo, *Agora* 15.240.11–12.

25 On other cults of Solon's time, but not linked to τὰ πάτρια, see Shapiro, 1996. They include Ares/Enyalios, Aphrodite Pandemos, Delian Apollo, and the heroes Ajax (and his sons) and Leos (and his daughters). Possible are also Zeus Olympios, Ge, and Dionysus in Limnai.

26 1) τρία ἱερῶν, 2) τρία κήρυξι καὶ πρεσβείαις, and 3) τρία ὁσίων.

27 For one of many possible references linking τὰ πάτρια to political, not religious *nomoi* of Solon, see Andoc. 1.88. By the fourth century at least the ephebes swore in their oath, τιμήσω ἱερὰ τὰ πάτρια (Lycurgus, *Leoc*. 77 and R&O #88.16), and the ἱερά here are probably "sanctuaries."

28 Cf. Dem. 19.70, where these prayers are termed an ἀρά.

29 τὰ γένη καὶ τὰς φρατρίας καὶ τὰς ἱερωσύνας εἴασεν ἔχειν ἑκάστους κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.

30 Cf. Plato, *Lg*. 6.759a8–b1.

τὰ πάτρια Possibly Later Than the Solonian Calendar

That the archon, not the basileus, administered the *pompe* and *agones* of the City Dionysia (*Ath. Pol.* 56.3–4), and the *heorte*'s presumed history make it likely that these elements, even in incipient form, were not part of the Solonian calendar, but τὰ πάτρια did control the sacrifices and, in Demosthenes' thought, the institution of the choruses.[31] Similarly the archon administered the *pompe* of the Asclepieia (*Ath. Pol.* 56.4), and Asclepius came to Athens only in 421 BC, but many attestations indicate that his priest sacrificed to Asclepius and the other gods οἷς πάτριον ἦν.[32] These πάτρια, however, may have been inherited from the Epidaurians from whom the Athenians imported the cult. We do not know the earliest association of Athens with Amphiaraus, but he did receive a major new *heorte* just after 335 and τὰ πάτρια of *SEG* 32.110.9 may refer back only to that time.

The upshot of all this is that most but perhaps not all cults, rituals, and religious duties linked to τὰ πάτρια can be traced back to Solonian times, probably to Solon's religious calendar and legislation. The provisions of that were the ultimate πάτρια. Some few were perhaps added later but go back to the sixth, fifth, and possibly the fourth century.[33] And there is the possibility, not remote, that some of the deities in my post-Solonian list reach back to Solonian times.[34]

---

31 *IG* II^2 780.7–8, 1011.66–7, and Dem. 21.51 and 54. On the foundation of the City Dionysia and some questions involved, see Parker, 1996.75–6 and 92–6.

32 See above, p. 114, note 32.

33 Artemis Phosphoros is probably linked with τὰ πάτρια only by her association with Apollo Prostaterios and Artemis Boulaia.

34 Thucydides (2.16.2) describes the Athenians who had to evacuate the countryside in 431 as καταλείποντες . . . ἱερὰ ἃ διὰ παντὸς ἦν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον πολιτείας πάτρια. The clause, because of the typically Thucydidean abstraction, is difficult to translate if not to understand. It is more than "abandoning . . . the hereditary temples of the ancient state" (Strassler, 1996), but perhaps less than "to leave behind ancestral holy places which were a permanent heritage of their origins as a community" (Whitehead, 1986.177). The emphasis is that the sanctuaries (not temples) were πάτρια (hence the difficulty in leaving them), and the two other clauses state for how long: "through all time" and "from their polis-status in very ancient times." That is, they date back, if not to the beginning, to very early times of the demesmen's political communities.

Two Classes of τὰ πάτρια?

It is perhaps worthwhile at this juncture to offer some refinements or elaborations of Chaniotis' description of τὰ πάτρια in his 2009 article. His πάτρια concern primarily sacrificial *ritual* norms: how an animal was sacrificed, that female victims were offered to goddesses, the wearing of crowns, the mechanics of purification, and other such ritual elements. It is correct to say that such πάτρια for Greek worshippers "made up the central core of ritual practices," were commonly known but, unfortunately for us, rarely discussed or described, and did not have "recognisable authors" but were referred to "the ancestors." These were the norms of the society and "are not subject to description, modification, or negotiation." In our texts we have seen a few examples in which individuals "sacrificed κατὰ τὰ πάτρια," and these πάτρια may be those Chaniotis describes.[35] But in an Athenian religious context, if we are correct, many of τὰ πάτρια were ascribed to Solon, were written down, were recodified and again written down, and covered a much wider range of religious activity than the details and procedures of rituals. Perhaps we need to see two "classes" of τὰ πάτρια in Athenian religious activities: those concerning ritual acts that are social and, perhaps, almost Panhellenic constructs, and those instituted, or at least codified, by identifiable ancestors for a specific polis and covering both broader and more specific topics. The latter are mostly what we find in our Athenian epigraphical and literary texts.

Why Follow τὰ πάτρια?

We conclude this discussion of τὰ πάτρια by stressing their religious importance. Again we turn to *SEG* 21.469C. The Athenians were going to observe τὰ πάτρια and make additions, "so that also from the gods they may acquire the deserved return favors" (19–20).[36] One observes τὰ πάτρια and, here, increases the sacrifices and honors of the god "to acquire the deserved return favors from the gods." In the preface to this *psephisma* even the εὐσέβεια of the Athenians is πάτριον: "Since it is πάτριον and a custom for the Demos of Athenians and it has been handed down by their ancestors to make εὐσέβεια towards the gods of the most importance and because of these things they have acquired the glory and fame for most famous deeds on both land and sea in many infantry

35 E.g., *SEG* 25.140.2–8 and 45.101.25–7 and *IG* II^2 1247. See Chapter 6.

36 ἵνα καὶ παρὰ τῶν θεῶ[ν] κτήσωνται τὰς καταξίας χάριτας.

and naval expeditions . . .” (2–6).[37] There is, in our texts, no better testament to the significance of τὸ πάτριον and to the importance and good results of ἡ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβεια.[38]

The orators help further identify the nature of these “deserved return favors” from the gods. In the *Areopagiticus* Isocrates praised the good, old days, the times of Solon and of the control of Athens’ political affairs by the Areopagus Council. People then, he claims, “were watching only that they not do away with any of τὰ πάτρια and they not add anything outside of τὰ νομίζομενα.”[39] τὰ πάτρια were the things which “the ancestors handed down to them” (7.29–30). The prosecutor of Nicomachus in Lysias 30.18 expands for us the statements in *SEG* 21.469C and links, as we have seen, τὰ πάτρια to Solon’s calendar, to τὰ ἐκ τῶν κυρβέων: “Our ancestors by sacrificing τὰ ἐκ τῶν κυρβέων handed down the polis that is the greatest and most *eudaimon* of the Greek cities, so that it is worthwhile for us to make the same sacrifices as they did, if for no other reason, because of the good fortune that resulted from those sacrifices.”[40] From observing τὰ πάτρια the ancestors of the Athenians won the reputation for and the glory of the most famous deeds on infantry and naval expeditions. They enjoyed good τύχη, and they handed down the greatest and most *eudaimon* of all Greek cities to their descendants. And, for this reason, one should continue observing τὰ πάτρια.

In both the inscriptions and the literary texts, τὰ πάτρια in a religious context is not just a casual, random phrase but is carefully used for only certain sacrifices, rituals, and religious duties, most of which had a Solonian pedigree. Following τὰ πάτρια brought “return favors” from the gods and was in part responsible for the great successes of Athens in the good, old days, in the days

37 ἐπειδὴ πάτριόν [ἐ]στ[ιν καὶ ἔ]θος τῶι δήμωι τῶι ᾽Αθηναίων καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων π[α]ραδε[δ]ομένον περὶ πλείστου ποεῖσθαι τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς [εὐσέβειαν] καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πολλα<ῖ>ς <πεζαῖς> καὶ ἐπὶ ναυσὶ στρατεί<αι>ς τὴν κλε[ιν]οτάτων ἔργων καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν εὐδοξία[ν] καὶ[εὐλογίαν κέκτ]ηνται. . . .

38 On the text and the national, international, religious, and political contexts of this important document, see Deshours, 2011.105–113. See also Stavrianopoulou, 2011.93–6 and Chaniotis, 1995.153–4 on this particular passage. For a translation, Mikalson, 1998.272–3.

39 ἐκεῖνο μόνον ἐτήρουν, ὅπως μηδὲν μήτε τῶν πατρίων καταλύσουσι μήτ᾽ ἔξω τῶν νομιζομένων προσθήσουσιν.

40 οἱ τοίνυν πρόγονοι τὰ ἐκ τῶν κύρβεων θύοντες μεγίστην καὶ εὐδαιμονεστάτην τῶν ῾Ελληνίδων τὴν πόλιν παρέδοσαν, ὥστε ἄξιον ἡμῖν τὰς αὐτὰς ἐκείνοις θυσίας ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ εἰ μηδὲν δι᾽ ἄλλο, τῆς τύχης ἕνεκα τῆς ἐκ ἐκείνων τῶν ἱερῶν γεγενημένης. Cf. Lysias 30.19, where the performance of τὰ πάτρια is linked to εὐσέβεια. In the *Rhetoric to Alexander* 2.11 and 38.12, maintenance of τὰ πάτρια is linked to *hosiotes*. The author (2.4) also claims, ἢ τοῖς ἰδιώταις ἢ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς πόλεως σύμφερον ἔσται κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τῶν ἱερῶν θυομένων.

before lots of ἐπίθετα were introduced. The implication is that performing τὰ πάτρια in our later period will bring the same good fortune, but the failure to maintain them may bring the opposite. And so the performance of τὰ πάτρια in our epigraphical texts is one more cause for giving honor and recognition to the individual who followed them.

Nomoi and *Psephismata*

It is not possible to draw hard and fast distinctions between what polis *nomoi* and *psephismata* direct or regulate in religious matters. We have the distinct *nomoi* of Solon, and the clear distinction between *nomoi* and *psephismata* after 403 BC, but in between there seems to have been no distinction made by the Athenians between what are sometimes called *nomoi*, sometimes *psephismata*.[41] Despite these limitations and complexities, some general patterns emerge.

If our identification of Solonian *nomoi*, or *nomoi* believed by IV BC Athenians to be Solonian, is generally correct (Chapter 7), then the Solonian *nomoi* concerning religious matters appear quite different in subject from legislation established later by the Athenian Demos. The Solonian *nomoi* deal with pollution, excluding adulteresses, prostitutes, women of ill repute, and those who refuse military service or desert from the sanctuaries of the polis. One excluded illegitimate children from τὰ ἱερά of the family. One may have required audits of certain polis priests and priestesses.[42] A few appear to be cult specific, concerning Demeter and Kore, the Delia, and the wife of the basileus in the rituals of the Anthesteria.[43] Surviving *nomoi*, as distinct from *psephismata*, from after 403, however, almost exclusively organize and especially provide financing for major religious innovations.[44] They set a specific financial and administrative structure as well as a more general religious program for the long term. *Psephismata* then take on the specifics at a later date: the deities to receive the sacrifices, distribution of the portions, duties

41 I use here for convenience of reference the numbers assigned in Chapter 7 to *nomoi* of Solon [**NS**], *nomoi* / *psephismata* until 403 [**N/PS**], and *nomoi* [**N**] and *psephismata* [**PS**] after 403.

42 Pollution, **NS 16**; adulteresses, **17**; prostitutes, **15**; ill repute, **14**; military service, **8**; illegitimate children, **13**; audits, **11**.

43 Demeter, **NS 14**; Delia, **10**; wife of basileus, **3**. **NS 9** might seem, by its concern with the Musaia and Hermaia, to be cult specific but probably just limited access to these to protect the young participants.

44 E.g., **N 8**, **9**, **10**, **11**, and **20**.

of individual officials, and any necessary changes to the financing.[45] When Demosthenes claimed (4.35–6) that "all things" (πάντα) of the City Dionysia and Panathenaia had been assigned by *nomos*, he no doubt included under *nomos* both the *nomoi* and *psephismata* for these *heortai* listed in Chapter 7, as well as many others lost to us.

The post-Solonian legislation in our texts is all cult specific, that is, it treats the cult of, for example, Amphiaraus or Demeter of Eleusis,[46] not all cults, practices, priests, or other religious officials under one piece of legislation. If the distinction between Solonian *nomoi* and post-Solonian legislation is correct, then the Solonian *nomoi* set down some basic, general rules concerning Athenian religious behaviors and norms, and the post-Solonian *nomoi* treat special, new situations arising in the context of individual, mostly pre-existing cults.[47] In this the new *nomoi* would appear to be largely addenda to the Solonian Code rather than changes to it. The *nomoi* of the demes are cult specific and go into more detail on religious arrangements, and in this they seem to combine what is separate in the polis *nomoi* and *psephismata*.

After 403 polis *psephismata*, more than *nomoi*, in addition to honoring officials for their services, take on the details of religious cults, sometimes assigning who should make the sacrifices, the distribution of the portions, and details of financing. They deal with what Chaniotis (2009.102) terms "stage directions" and "the variable ritual elements."[48] They also, unlike *nomoi*, are used to introduce single new sacrifices (vs. new annual sacrifices and *heortai*).[49] This is true also of deme *psephismata*. Polis *psephismata* after 403 also dictated Athenian participation in foreign *heortai*, on occasion ordered the establishment or reestablishment of boundaries for sanctuaries, and detailed procedures for the remaking of dedications in specific sanctuaries, all occasional, not long term events. So, too, they could order the repair of a statue for a sanctuary.[50]

In very general terms, then, we have Solonian *nomoi* which seem to have canonized some basic rules about restrictions created by various forms of pollution, about priests, priestesses, and sanctuaries, and such general matters. If we had them all, they no doubt would cover a much broader range of such subjects. Some dealt also with individual cults, with, e.g., the *aparche* owed

45 E.g., **PS 11**, **13**, **14**, **15**, **21**, **22**, **24**, **28**, **23**, and **51**.

46 Amphiaraus, **N 8** and **9**; Demeter, **15**, **16**, and **17**.

47 As in **N 8**, **10**, **15**, **16**, **17**, **20**, **11**, **12**, **19**, **13**, **14**, and **22**.

48 Cf. Stavrianopoulou, 2011.95.

49 **PS 17**, **18**, and **19**.

50 Foreign *heortai*, **PS 25**, **26**, **28**; boundaries, **29**; dedications, **35**, **36**, **37**, and **38**; statue, **34**. There is one major exception here. *SEG* 21.469C of 129/8 by a *psephisma* [**PS 20**] introduces a major rehabilitation and expansion of some cults and *heortai* of Apollo.

to Demeter of Eleusis. *Nomoi* after 403 laid out long-term provisions for *heortai*, with heavy emphasis on the finances and the administrative structure.[51] *Psephismata* furnished the details of these or emended them, and also dealt with more routine, ephemeral religious matters.[52] And the legislation of all periods dealt almost exclusively with polis cults and deities, not with those of the deme, the family, or private associations, and this would accord with the *nomos* attributed to Solon [**NS 12**] that granted autonomy to such cults in their internal arrangements.[53] Two points, both *ex silentio*, should be noted. Firstly, the number of cults affected by polis legislation might initially seem large, but it is a very small percentage of the literally thousands of cults and sanctuaries in Athens and Attica. There was, in terms of percentage, very little polis interference by legislation in the cults of Athens. And, secondly, in all of this, again with the exception of *SEG* 21.469C of 129/8 [**PS 20**], it is remarkable how much legislative activity concerning cults, apart from the honorary decrees, occurred in the fourth century, especially in the Lycurgan era, and first half of the third century, almost to disappear thereafter.[54] From our documents we might conclude that polis cult was largely static in terms of development and change by legislative processes from the middle of the third century to the end of our period.

Oracles

Among the oracles Pythian Apollo's predominance in directing Athenian's religious affairs is obvious.[55] Of the thirty-one occasions listed, twenty-one are

51 Cf. Lambert, 2012a.79–80: "The institution of a new festival or the introduction of new elements into an existing one normally required a law, rather than a decree, for such measures affected a fundamental aspect of the Athenian constitution, i.e., the city's sacrificial calendar, a central component of the laws of Solon and in the revision of Athenian law effected by Nicomachos' commission at the end of the fifth century."

52 On the distinction between laws and decrees in IV BC, see Lambert, 2012a.80. n. 65: "While it was possible to draw an abstract distinction between law as something permanent and general and decrees as specific or of particular application (Rhodes, 1987.14 and n. 48), like Rhodes, I am unconvinced by the argument of M. H. Hansen, *GRBS* 19 (1978), 315–20 and 20 (1979), 27–53 that this was applied systematically in practice."

53 On the autonomy of the Thracian orgeones of Bendis, see Wijma, 2014.152–3.

54 On the distribution of *nomoi* in and after IV BC and on possible reasons behind it, see Lambert, 2012a.58–9.

55 On the authority of oracles in general in the Athenian context, see Parker, 2005.105–15 and Garland, 1990.87–91.

certainly and an additional six are likely Delphic responses. Zeus of Dodona is responsible for three, two of which concern his own cult. Amphiaraus appears once, also in connection with his own cult.

Of more interest are the dates. For most oracles we have only a *terminus ante quem*, and their date may be many years, even centuries before our source. Six of our oracles appear to date as early as the sixth century BC, eight probably from the fifth century, and eleven from the fourth century, and none certainly after that.[56] The latest are from the 330's: from Zeus of Dodona about Dione's statue, from Amphiaraus about his sanctuary, from Apollo on a fine owed to Olympia, and from Apollo on gilding his new altar. The latest confidently dated oracle from Apollo of Delphi, on the fine to Olympia, is from 332/1. After IV BC, in fact after the age of Lycurgus, the Athenian polis seemingly did not inquire at oracles to determine religious questions but used only preexisting oracles, and did that only rarely.[57]

The purpose for making an oracular inquiry is occasionally stated. Sometimes it is to determine if it was, in the familiar Delphic formula, λῷον καὶ ἄμεινον to do the proposed action. More interesting for our purposes is the concern with εὐσέβεια. One consults the oracle, to quote *IG* II^3 292.51–3, "so that τὰ πρὸς τὼ θεὼ may be as εὐσεβῆ as possible and so that for the future nothing ἀσεβές may happen."[58]

---

56 VI BC or earlier, those concerning the Praxiergidae, the eponymous heroes, Aeacus, the Mother of the Gods, new altars in various sanctuaries, the City Dionysia, and Delos; V BC, concerning Theseus, Echetlaios, Bendis, Apollo Patroös, Alochos, the Eleusinian "first fruits," and restoring the Delians; IV BC, concerning the Pythaïs, an altar for Ares and Athena Areia, *kosmos* for various deities, the gilding of Apollo's altar, the *hiera orgas*, Hermes Hegemonios, an Olympic fine, the statue of Dione at Dodona, and Amphiaraus on his sanctuary. For an oracle of the Roman period, see Fontenrose, 1978.H58 = *IG* II^2 1096. The distribution of oracles in the Greek world concerning "political" matters and personal inquiries is quite different, and for that see Bonnechere, 2013.

57 Parker (2005.115) concludes that "the Athenians seldom, after 479, sent delegations to the fixed shrines except with questions about cult." See also his discussion of the general decline of use of the oracles for political affairs after V BC (1985.320–4), now questioned by Bonnechere, 2013. Also, Parker's review of the activities of the chresmologues (2005.111–14) suggests that, however influential in political and public debates, they were not consulted on religious questions. One exception may be *IG* I^3 40. On divine signs and omens, their interpreters, and their influence on public opinion in Athens of the classical period, see Trampedach, 2015.258–94.

58 [ὅπ]ω[ς] ἄ[ν] ὡς εὐσεβέστατα ἔχει τὰ πρὸς τὼ θεὼ [καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς τὸν λοιπ]ὸ[ν] χρόνον μηδὲν ἀσεβὲς γίγνητ[αι]. Cf. *SEG* 21.519.4–10.

Interaction of τὰ πάτρια, *Nomoi* and *Psephismata*, and Oracles

We saw in Chapters 6, 7, and 8 that τὰ πάτρια, *nomoi, psephismata*, and oracles are distinct religious authorities, but they also often interact and intersect.[59] An oracle, for example, may urge obedience to the *nomoi* or τὰ πάτρια. Xenophon (*Mem*. 1.3.1) has the Delphic Oracle, when asked "how one must act concerning sacrifice or the service to ancestors or any other such thing," respond that "by acting in accordance with the *nomos* of the city, people would be acting with "proper respect" (εὐσεβῶς).[60] Theophrastus in his *On Piety* claimed that Apollo advised "to sacrifice κατὰ τὰ πάτρια" (Porphry, *de Abst*. 11.59), a statement echoed in Anaximenes' *Rhetoric to Alexander* 2. 3. We have already seen that Demosthenes (21.51–56) may be saying that oracles bid the Athenians to perform actions in the City Dionysia κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, actions which also were governed by *nomoi*.[61] In a different interaction Lycurgus in 331 charged that Leocrates had betrayed "the temples, the statues (of the gods), the sanctuaries, and the honors (τιμαί) and sacrifices in the *nomoi*, the honors and sacrifices handed down by your ancestors" (*Leoc*. 1–2). Here the τιμαί and θυσίαι both are "in the *nomoi*" and are "handed down by the ancestors," that is, they are πάτρια.[62] These relatively simple situations indicate that the four authorities can be intertwined, and we now treat as examples three cases whose richer documentation allows a better look at how these intersections played out in cultic life. The fullest accounts we have, about the cult of Bendis, of the decision about the sacred property of Amphiaraus, and about the renewal and revision of the cult of Apollo in 129/8, suggest that often the relationship among these authorities was more complex than simpler accounts might indicate and that there was, among them, a hierarchy.

Bendis

We look first to the best documented case of founding a new cult, that of Bendis, and perhaps therefore the most complex example of multiple

59 Although not expressly calling them τὰ πάτρια, Plato in the *Laws* (5.738b5–c3) would have his lawgiver respect pre-existing sacrifices, altars, temples, and statues of the gods, some of which resulted from oracles of Apollo at Delphi, Zeus at Dodona, or Ammon at Siwa. Others were based on "old accounts" (παλαιοὶ λόγοι) which persuaded the people, either by portents or inspirations (ἐπίνοιαι) from the gods. On this see Mikalson, 2010.57.

60 On this see Mikalson, 2010.58 and 131–2. *Nomos* here may well refer to "custom" or "tradition," not *nomos* in the legal sense.

61 Above, p. 126.

62 τιμὰς καὶ is in only one ms., and, if excluded, as commonly, only θυσίαι would be involved here.

authorities in the founding of and later changes to a cult.[63] *IG* I^3 136 of 413/2 (?) is a *nomos* / *psephisma* [**N/PS 6**] treating major elements of the cult, including prayers, sacrifices, an *aparche*, the statue of the goddess, a *pannychis*, the priest, dispensation of perquisites, and some financial arrangements. But the cult had been founded earlier, before 429/8, and *IG* II^2 1283 of 261/0 claims that the Demos of Athenians had given the devotees of Bendis *enktesis*, the right of purchasing land, and the establishment of their sanctuary (ἵδρυσιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ), "in accordance with the oracle from Dodona" (4–6).[64] The polis also ordered, though apparently without oracular sanction, that the orgeones hold a *pompe* from the Prytaneion to Piraeus (6–12). This grant of rights described in *IG* II^2 1283 must have predated *IG* I^3 136 and was quite likely a (now lost) *nomos* / *psephisma*. The Thracian orgeones of Bendis believe that they are obeying "the *nomos* of the city" in holding their *pompe*. But the *nomos* to which they refer may have been a *psephisma*, like the *psephisma* of 333/2 which granted to the Citians *enktesis* and the founding of their sanctuary of Aphrodite (*IG* II^3 337 [**PS 54**]),[65] and so we shall treat it here.

We have thus far (1) a *nomos* / *psephisma* authorizing a new cult, probably only for Thracians resident in Athens, granting it ἔγκτησις and ἵδρυσις, and based on an oracle from Dodona, before 429/8. That is followed by (2) a *nomos* / *psephisma* of 413/2 significantly setting out details of the cult and perhaps representing a change of the cult from purely Thracian devotees to both Athenian and Thracian. And (3), in *IG* II^2 1283 of 261/0 the devotees of Bendis refer to the original "*nomos*" (1) of the polis.

In terms of the sacrifices and prayers of the *heorte* of Bendis, the Thracian orgeones in *IG* II^2 1283 claim to be acting κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τῶν Θραικῶν and according to the *nomos* of the city.[66] So we have here an oracle, Athenian *nomoi* / *psephismata*, and Thracian πάτρια. The ultimate authority, however, for the establishment of the cult is the oracle which then the *psephismata* and the Thracian πάτρια elaborate. In this and the cases to follow one should not imagine that an oracle came unexpectedly and unsought, here from Dodona but usually from Delphi, about the establishment of a new deity or a new *heorte*.

63 For bibliography on the introduction of the cult of Bendis to Athens, see p. 152, note 113 above.

64 On *IG* II^2 1283, see Wijma, 2014.136–9 and Jones, 1999.257–61. On grants of *enktesis* and this inscription and its context, see Pecírka, 1996.122–30. On Bendis and Dodona, see Parke, 1967.149.

65 For discussion of this text, see R&O #91.

66 For a similar concern of the thiasotai of Bendis on Salamis with both *nomoi* and τὰ πάτρια, see *SEG* 44.60.4–5.

Rather, the Athenians would have drawn up plans for such things themselves and then would have sought the approval of the oracle. The initiative comes from the Athenians, the Athenians pass a *psephisma* to consult the oracle, the oracle approves of the plan, and then follows the legislation that implements the initiative.[67] The particulars of the cult are then determined by the devotees. But the oracle is the ultimate divine sanction of the initiative, and without its approval there would be no new cult.

Amphiaraus

At some time in the period 330–324 the Athenians decided to divide newly acquired public lands among the ten tribes, with pairs of tribes receiving allotments. After the division had been made and some incomes received, the concern arose whether one of the parcels was in fact sacred to Amphiaraus. It was decided to have three citizens sleep in the temple of Amphiaraus to receive divine instruction. Euxenippus, one of the three, reported a dream that apparently favored the tribes' claims over those of Amphiaraus. Polyeuctus, dissatisfied with the outcome, proposed a *psephisma* that the two tribes give up the land to Amphiaraus and that the other tribes compensate them. The proposal was defeated in the Ekklesia, and Polyeuctus was charged with and convicted of making an illegal proposal and was fined twenty-five drachmas. Not content, Polyeuctus then in court charged that Euxenippus had falsely reported the dream. Lycurgus gave a now lost speech against Euxenippus, and Hyperides gave a speech (4) in support of him, a speech which survives and is the source for all the information on the events.[68] The outcome of the trial is not known. We have here an instance of the interplay of divination and various legislative and legal maneuvers. When uncertainty about the land arose, the Athenians probably proposed through a *psephisma* the consultation of Amphiaraus. Hyperides considers Euxenippus' dream as "what the god (Amphiaraus) ordered" (4.14), but Polyeuctus was prepared to countermand that with a *psephisma*. When that failed for whatever reason, he attempted through the legal system to invalidate the dream. Hyperides (4.15) claims that Polyeuctus should not have proposed the *psephisma* but should rather have sent to Delphi to find the truth. For Hyperides, apparently, the proper procedure would have been to challenge one divination with another, here another that was more authoritative, not to introduce legislative steps.

67 For a similar procedure for "political" (vs. religious) questions, see Bonnechere, 2013, esp. 373–4.

68 On this speech and all matters concerning it, see Whitehead, 2000.153–262.

In any case, the authority of divination is apparently regarded by all as primary, and the dispute concerns only human falsifying of it.

The Refurbishing of Some Cults of Apollo

In 129/8, the year before an Athenian Pythaïs, Timarchus of Sphettos, tamias of the Boule, before the Boule "revived" some oracles of Apollo and the "existing honors (τὰ ὑπάρχοντα . . . [τίμ]ια) assigned through *nomoi* (δ[ιὰ νόμων τεταγμέν]<α>) to the god" (*SEG* 21.469C. 15–17 [**PS 20**]).[69] Xenophon of Sunium then made a formal proposal to the Boule that included additional honors for Apollo, additions to those previously passed by *psephismata*. These include more sacrifices and *pompai*.[70] The personnel and financing for the sacrifices, prayers, and *pompai*, for probably both τὰ πάτρια and τὰ ἐπίθετα, are then detailed. The Boule then by a *probouleuma* voted to recommend to the Ekklesia to do "the other things for Apollo according to oracles *and* for the basileus, archon, and the strategoi to sacrifice sacrifices in addition to those previously established by *psephismata* (ἐπὶ τοῖς προεψηφμισμένοις)." They were to perform the sacrifices and make the *pompai* at the Thargelia each year, leading sacrificial victims that are as beautiful as possible (22–7). The purpose was, as we have seen before, "so that they may acquire from the gods the deserved return favors" (19–20). We have here prior oracles and sacrifices and honors of the god, some of which have been established previously by *nomoi* and *psephismata*. They are τὰ πάτρια for these late second-century Athenians. Timarchus detailed these for the Boule. The *probouleuma* of the Boule was then accepted, through a *psephisma*, by the Ekklesia and hence published on stone. We have here the full interplay of all four religious authorities: oracles, τὰ πάτρια, and *nomoi* and *psephismata*. But, again, when included in the text, the oracles are always given first.

In the foundation of cults and the management of sacred property, oracles or other divination, *psephismata*, the secular law, and τὰ πάτρια could be interwoven. *Psephismata* could order the use of divination; the divination could order or approve of a new cult, a reworking of an old cult, or matters of the

69 If this is the correct reading. See above, p. 121, note 5. On all other aspects of this text, see Deshours, 2011.105–13 and 304–6 and on the interaction of the authorities here, Chaniotis, 2009.100–1.

70 Oracles and τὰ πάτρια come into play also concerning specific provisions in the text. In the section on Apollo Patroös it is claimed that Apollo through oracles ordered the Athenians to "entreat" (λ[ι]ταν[εῦσ]α[ι]) the god called Patroös and to make the [πατρί]ου[ς θυσί]ας at the appropriate times of the year to Apollo, sacrificing as is πάτριον for the Demos (11–14). On this see p. 158.

sanctuary; and then, again, *psephismata* could implement the instructions received through divination.[71] And, in some cases, legal prosecutions could arise which if successful could, presumably, overturn the results of divination. Also, as in the cult of Bendis, τὰ πάτρια of the worshippers could come into play. But, despite the number of factors, at the apex of authority stands the divination—it gave the authoritative response, and the other elements were only introduced to occasion it, to implement it, or, probably in rare cases, to challenge it.

71 Cf. Parker (2005a.67), "One was also supposed to worship the gods 'in accord with tradition' ('as modified by decrees of the assembly,' we must add, to make the formula fit known facts), not in one's own way."

PART 3

Approbation and Authority

∴

CHAPTER 10

The Rhetoric to Alexander

The author of the *Rhetoric to Alexander*, probably Anaximenes, proffered at the mid- or late IV BC advice and "talking points" to orators.[1] Book II is devoted to those planning to make "deliberative" speeches before the Boule or the Ekklesia. Here he introduces seven topics, but the first, as is always appropriate, is περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν.[2] Of this potentially large subject he describes only three arguments to be made, for the maintenance of established ἱερά or for the enhancement or diminution of them (2.3–12). This document echoes and reinforces much that we have seen already piecemeal under both Part 1 (*Approbation*) and Part 2 (*Authority*) and offers an opportunity to review this in a larger context. We therefore offer a translation of this valuable document and a commentary on elements that have waxed large in this study.

> (1) Concerning "sacred things" (τῶν ἱερῶν) it is necessary to speak in three ways: for we shall say that we must guard carefully the established ones (τὰ καθεστῶτα), or that we must change them to be more μεγαλοπρεπές, or to be more humble (ἐπὶ τὸ ταπεινότερον). (2) When we say that we must guard carefully the existing ones, we will find starting points (for our arguments) (3) *from what is just*, saying that among all people it is unjust to transgress the ancestral customs (τὰ πάτρια ἔθη) and (4) that all the oracular responses (τὰ μαντεῖα πάντα) order humans to make their sacrifices κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, (5) and that it is necessary that there remain the attention (τὰς ἐπιμελείας) about the gods which those who first founded cities and established the sacred rites (τὰ ἱερά) had; (6) *from what is advantageous*, saying that in terms of taxes (?) it will be advantageous for the private citizen or the community of the city when the victims (τὰ ἱερά) are sacrificed according κατὰ τὰ πάτρια and (7) that the citizens will profit in terms of courage since the citizens would be more courageous, feeling a sense of honor (φιλοτιμούμενοι), when the hoplites, cavalrymen, and light armed troops escort them in *pompai*; (8) *from what is beautiful*

1 Chiron, 2007, dates it to about 340 and is inclined to accept its common ascription to Anaximenes of Lampsacus (ca. 380–320). The author's viewpoint is, Chiron claims (p. 92), "definitely that of a Greek man living in the city of Athens or teaching in Athens." For a translation and discussion see Mirhady, 2011.

2 See, e.g., Mikalson, 1983.13–17.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_013

(ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ), if the result is that the *heortai* are made splendid (λαμπράς); (9) *from pleasure*, if there is some elaboration directed towards spectacle (πρὸς τὸ θεωρεῖσθαι) concerning the sacrifices of the gods; (10) *from what is practical*, if there has been neither a deficiency nor an excess in these sacrifices. When we speak in favor of the existing sacred things, so must we proceed and examine them from what has been said or from similar things, and examine how it is possible to teach people about what is being said.

(11) But when we are advising to change (μεθιστάναι) the rituals (ἱεροποιίας) to make them more μεγαλοπρεπεῖς, we will have plausible starting points for disturbing (τὰ πάτρια) by saying that to add to existing ones is not to destroy but to augment (αὔξειν) them; (12) secondly, that it is reasonable that the gods are better intentioned (εὐνουστέρους) to those who honor them more; (13) thirdly, that not even our fathers held their sacrifices always in the same way but rather, looking at current conditions and their successes, were establishing in law (ἐνομοθέτουν) the "service" (θεραπείαν) towards the gods both individually and communally; (14) and, fourthly, just as in all other things, so in this way we manage our cities and private estates. (15) And say also that, when these (new) things have been done, there will be some benefit or splendor (λαμπρότης) or pleasure for the city, pursuing the topic just as has been described in the previous cases.

(16) When we are reducing the sacred things so that they become more humble, one must bring the argument back to current circumstances, that is, (17) why the citizens are more poorly off than before; (18) secondly, that it is not reasonable that the gods find *charis* (χαίρειν) in the cost of the animals sacrificed but in the demonstrations of "proper respect" (ταῖς εὐσεβείαις) of those who are sacrificing; (19) thirdly, that both gods and men judge foolish those who do what is beyond their means; (20) fourthly, that matters about civil expenses depend not only on humans but also on successes and failures.

These and similar starting points we will have for the propositions concerning sacrifices. (21) But so that we may know how to describe things and propose *nomoi* concerning the best sacrifice (τὴν κρατίστην θυσίαν), let us define also this. The best sacrifice of all is that which (22) is "religiously correct" (ὁσίως) in respect to the gods, (23) is moderate in respect to expenses, (24) is beneficial in respect to war, (25) and is splendid (λαμπρῶς) in respect to viewings (τὰς θεωρίας). (26) It will be "religiously correct" in respect to the gods if τὰ πάτρια are not done away with (καταλύηται), (27) moderate in respect to expenses if not all the

> things taken in a *pompe* are used up, (28) splendid in respect to viewings if someone uses abundantly gold and such other things which are not used up, and (29) beneficial in respect to wars if cavalry-men and hoplites in full armor join in the *pompe*. (30) From these we will prepare κάλλιστα the things relating to the gods. (2. 3–12).

In treating τὰ ἱερά the author invokes the religious authorities we have seen before: oracles (4), τὰ πάτρια (4, 6, 11, 26), and *nomoi* (13, 21).[3] Oracles are mentioned only briefly to assert, as we have seen before, the importance of τὰ πάτρια. Two of the references to τὰ πάτρια (4, 6) explicitly concern sacrifices, and so may the other two (11, 26). *Nomoi* are both preexisting ones (13) and new ones which might be proposed (21). We do not find *psephismata*, but the author is giving arguments to be used before the Boule and Ekklesia where *psephismata* are made. In many cases, theoretically, the arguments he proposes would result in *psephismata* περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν.

The author limits himself to sacrifices (4, 6, 13, 18, 20, 21), *heortai* (8), and *pompai* (7, 27, 29). He may be distinguishing between ἱερά that are καθεστῶτα (1, 10) and those that are πάτρια (4, 6, 10, 11, 26). Presumably not all of the former were the latter. The author speaks of "change" (μεθίστασθαι) of ἱερά (1, 11), not of elimination (καταλύεσθαι, 26). So, too, of "reducing" them (16), not eliminating them. One can imagine changes to τὰ πάτρια without the elimination of the central event. A sacrifice to Athena Polias at the Panathenaia on Hekatombaion 28 may have been τὸ πάτριον, but the number of animals sacrificed was not πάτριον and could be changed from year to year. So, too, could the costs of the sacrifices, of the *pompe*, and of the whole *heorte* rise or fall from year to year. The concerns of the *Rhetoric* are very much financial and economic, as are those of Lysias 30, but with a more theoretical emphasis on moderation (10, 23, 27, 28) and a practical concern with current economic circumstances (13, 14, 16, 17, 20), both highly Aristotelian.

If the polis spends more on τὰ ἱερά, the movement is ἐπὶ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπέστερον (1, 11), and we will see in Chapter 13 the connotations of both financial generosity and public benefaction and display in μεγαλοπρέπεια. If the polis spends less, the movement is ἐπὶ τὸ ταπεινότερον (1, 16), a surprisingly negative word for the point the author is trying to make but the usual antonym of μεγαλοπρεπής.

One can argue for greater expenditure ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ, and this is perhaps the surest example we have seen of καλόν in a religious context being "beautiful," of τὸ καλόν pointing to an esthetics of Athenian religious practice. The example

3 That it is a matter of justice (τὸ δίκαιον) not to transgress τὰ πάτρια ἔθη (3) may indicate that it is also a matter of *nomoi*.

the author gives is the "splendor" of *heortai* (8) and sacrifices (15, 25), and that "splendor" is what is "seen," is in the "spectacle" (8, 15, 25, 28). The author distinguishes between the beauty (8) and the pleasure (9), but both result from the "spectacle" of τὰ ἱερά. They are expected to be splendid, beautiful, and pleasurable.[4]

Distinct from the esthetic argument is that from the advantages that τὰ ἱερά bring to the city, and these advantages include greater revenues (6),[5] an uplift in physical courage among the citizens (7, 24, 29),[6] and, the only "religious" purpose given, the winning of the εὔνοια of the gods by honoring them (12).[7] The last is a concept we find echoed in our epigraphical texts.

The author introduces the concept of ὁσιότης, "religious correctness," which is very important in the oratorical and philosophical traditions but is, somewhat surprisingly, virtually absent from our epigraphical sources.[8] For the author the best sacrifice must be, first of all, "religiously correct" (22), and will be so if "τὰ πάτρια are not done away with" (26). So it is not only "just" (before men) but also "correct" (before the gods) to maintain τὰ πάτρια. One reason that "religious correctness" does not occur in our many honorary decrees may be that the status of the honorand "before men" is, in these contexts, much more in the foreground than his status "before the gods."

Finally, the author claims that from his teachings "we will prepare κάλλιστα the things relating to the gods" (30), the meaning of which statement I have endeavored better to understand in this book.[9]

---

4 On the nature of *heortai* in this regard, see Mikalson, 1982.

5 The financial advantage to the citizen or city here is hard to discern, unless the speaker has in mind a source of revenue such as the dermaticon fund of *IG* II^2 1496, but even this was a means only to recover part of what the state had already spent.

6 That observers felt personal courage when they saw armed fellow countrymen in a *pompe* (7, 24, 29) is an interesting insight not, I think, paralleled elsewhere.

7 That one could win greater εὔνοια from the gods by honoring them more (12), that is, by spending more money on τὰ ἱερά, seems to have been the common view. The counter argument offered here (18), that the gods have more *charis* for εὐσέβεια than for the number of victims, comes from philosophy and seems to have remained there. On this see Mikalson, 2010.61–4.

8 See Appendix 4. On "religious correctness," see Mikalson, 2011, *passim*.

9 See Chapter 13.

CHAPTER 11

Authority of the Polis

In an important study published in 1984 Robert Garland introduced the topic of what he termed "religious authority" in archaic and classical Athens, i.e., "an investigation about who has the right in the Athenian state to act authoritatively both in the name of, and in matters of, religion."[1] It was the first study to look at the religious complex of Athens holistically, not at just one element as, for example, priests. I would like to build on that excellent study in a few ways: by extending it into the Hellenistic period; by extending it beyond polis cults to deme, *genos*, and the private cults of various types; and by contrasting "rights" to "actions," that is, what the Ekklesia, Boule, and various officials actually did in contrast to what they may have had the authority to do.

Garland explicitly treats religious authority *within* the polis. In two papers Sourvinou-Inwood properly draws attention to the centrality of the individual polis in a Panhellenic context, to the fact that significant elements of Greek religion varied from polis to polis, and that we should therefore view the polis as a central organizing unit for Greek religion.[2] This is quite different from religious authority within the polis, but Sourvinou-Inwood moves from one to the other, with the result that she concludes "that in the classical period polis religion encompassed, symbolically legitimated, and regulated all religious activity within the polis, not only the cults of polis subdivisions such as the demes, but also cults which modern commentators are inclined to consider private, such as, for example, *oikos* cults" (1990.322).

Since Sourvinou-Inwood's papers, scholars have been reasserting the supremacy of Athenian polis control over the religion within its borders.[3] Those who make such claims depend on Sourvinou-Inwood, sometimes referring to Garland's article. But, in fact, Garland offers a much more nuanced and complex picture. He introduces his study by claiming that "Religious authority in archaic and classical Athens was not in fact the preserve of any single social

1 Garland, 1984, reprised in 1990. For an excellent modern survey of the topic, see Deshours, 2011.19–22.

2 Sourvinou-Inwood, 1990 and 1988, both conveniently reprinted in Buxton, 2000.13–55.

3 Horster, 2010.179: "It was the assembly of the (male) Athenian citizens that decided about all subjects concerning cult and religion." Rhodes, 2009.13, "Every major aspect of religion in Athens was, or could be, controlled by the organs of the state." For my study Rhodes' "could be" clause is of major importance.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_014

or political class, caste, or milieu. Its essence was complex and it had many sources and outlets" (75), and he concludes it with "religious authority . . . was the monopoly neither of the citizen body as a whole nor of any particular group of individuals within it. It was a discrete prerogative shared out among a number of corporations comprising amateurs as well as experts, clergy as well as laity" (p. 120). So, we need to decide whether, as Sourvinou-Inwood and others would have it, the Athenian polis encompassed and regulated all religious activity in its territory, or, as Garland argues, that religious authority was fragmented, broken up among various legislative, administrative, priestly, and elected, allotted, or appointed individuals and groups.

It is critically important to understand the nature, extent, limitations, and realities of polis "control" within the polis if we wish to understand further the Greek religious experience. What aspects of religion did the polis have the right *or* exercise the right to control and manage? Did it exercise control over only the polis cults, by which I mean those cults available to all citizens of Athens? Was it really, as Sourvinou-Inwood claims (1990.302), "the ordered community, the polis, which assumed the role played in Christianity by the Church?" Is it a fact that "polis religion embraces, contains, and mediates all religious discourse?" What was its relationship to deme, gentilic, household, and private cults? What would all of this mean in the religious experience of the individual citizens? Did they feel the presence or the authority of the polis in all their religious activities? Or in what aspects of them? Or, to throw the question in another direction, was Greek religion at Athens a carefully ordered, directed, and managed religious system, or was it a patchwork that developed from ad hoc situations at various times? And, in what ways was the "polis" itself a religious agent, making prayers, sacrifices, dedications, and such things? How, when, and where did it express itself as a religious agent?

The Ekklesia and the Demos

The highest authority in Athens was, of course, the *Ekklesia*, the legislative body including all citizens. It alone passed *nomoi* and *psephismata* that were in force for all living in Attica.[4] Through these *nomoi* and *psephismata* it could have controlled every aspect of religion, but did it?[5] It had the right, in

4 On the authority and powers of the Ekklesia and on their limitations, see Hansen, 1987, esp. 94–124.

5 If one looks only at what the Ekklesia could do, Parker (2005.88) is absolutely correct in this statement, "If we ignore here issues of influence and authority and look merely at the formal

Garland's term, but how did it exercise that right? The first item on the agenda for two of the four meetings of the Ekklesia each month was τὰ ἱερά "the sacred things,"[6] the mere fact of which should give pause to those making another general claim, that Athenians did not distinguish "religion" from their other activities, that, in their own terminology, they did not distinguish between τὰ ἱερά and τὰ ὅσια, i.e., between the "sacred things" and those that were under "no religious restrictions."[7]

We have in the *nomoi* and *psephismata* surveyed in Chapter 7 a fairly large sample of what the Ekkesia must have considered under τὰ ἱερά, and that was, almost exclusively, matters concerning the polis deities (Athena Polias, Nike, Asclepius, Hephaestus, Theseus, Dionysus Eleuthereus, Demeter and Kore, Agathe Tyche, Apollo Patroös, Mother of the Gods, and Poseidon of Piraeus) and the polis *heortai* (Panathenaia, City Dionysia, Thargelia, Dionysia in Piraeus, Lenaia, and Amphiaraia).[8] So, initially, the number of deities with which the Demos through the Ekklesia involved itself was rather small. But what activities of the cults of these polis deities did the Ekklesia in fact regulate? Here we can turn to Garland's three general categories of religious authority in the Demos: finances, prosecution of crimes, and "the power to initiate." The *nomoi* and *psephismata* surveyed in Chapter 7 are, in fact, predominately concerned with the finances of new and existing cults, whether it be the costs of sacrificial animals or the leasing of sacred properties. This more-or-less persistent concern with finances apparent in these *nomoi* and *psephismata* supports the view that the "so-called" polis religious calendar of festivals and sacrifices, the one initially organized by Solon, then "written up" by Nicomachus and his associates in 404 and soon thereafter published on stone, was

---

right to legislate, the matter is very simple: during the period open to our observation, power lies in the council and assembly and in no other place. The people decides what gods are to be worshipped by what rituals at what times and places and at what expense; it regulates too the duties and terms of office of priests and priestesses, and creates new priesthoods at need." If one looks at what the Ekklesia and Boule did do, the situation is much more complicated, as I hope to show. It will be argued in this Chapter that very few of items that Parker assigns to the legislative right of the Boule and Ekklesia were, in fact, ever or primarily determined by their legislation. This important distinction had been mentioned in passing by Aleshire (1994.11–12).

6 Aeschin. 1.23 and *Ath. Pol.* 43.6. See Hansen, 1987.27–8.

7 Rhodes (2009.13) emphasizes the "embeddedness" of religion in Athenian political and social life but recognizes the significance of the distinction between ἱερά and ὅσια in the agenda of the Ekklesia.

8 On the Dionysia in Piraeus as a polis festival, see *Ath. Pol.* 54.8 and Pickard-Cambridge, 1988.46.

fundamentally a financial document. It was not intended primarily to prescribe the deities, victims, and days of sacrifice for the Athenians but to prescribe the costs for the victims and for the emoluments for officials.[9] So, too, the numerous and varied inventories of dedications are there to record their financial value and the transition of their safekeeping from one year's set of officials to another's. So, thus far, the Ekklesia's interest seems to be in polis deities only, and primarily in the finances of the cult, often down to the obol.

In one particular way the polis asserted its control over some cults. From at least 434/3 it began the practice, in times of financial emergency, of borrowing from sanctuaries, or, as it was said, from "gods," money and dedications.[10] Most familiar in this regard is Pericles' inclusion (Th. 2.13.5) among the resources available to Athenians at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War the unminted gold and silver of the private and public dedications and "sacred equipment" (ἱερὰ σκεύη) for the *pompai* and *agones*, and such things on the Acropolis, amounting to not less than 500 talents. He added also χρήματα from "the other sanctuaries," and concluded, no doubt shockingly, with the removable gold from the Athena statue, alone worth 40 talents. The Athenians, he said, could use this ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ but then were to restore it. And, in fact, the inscriptions reveal that the Athenians did just this. They melted down for coinage seven of the eight gold statues of Athena Nike in 407/6, the worst financial times of the War, and they were not "restored" until the Lycurgan period.[11] The Athenians also utilized resources "from the other sanctuaries" that Pericles suggested. Some cash and precious objects, surely not all, were collected from certain sanctuaries in Attica and were deposited and stored on the Acropolis. Polis tamiai "of Athena" or "of the other gods" then were responsible for these deposits and managed payments from and to them and the eventual repayment, with interest, to the sanctuaries.[12] From the records and inventories of these tamiai,[13] one can isolate which deities these were.[14] They include Artemis Agrotera, Bendis, Hephaestus,

9 On Solon's calendar, Parker (1996.53) concludes, "A prime function of the sixth-century code was surely to define what monies of the Athenian people were to be expended on what gods." See also Whitehead, 1986.174 and 186.

10 On this practice, see Linders, 1987 and Parker, 1985.73.

11 Mikalson, 1998.28. Such melting down of dedications into coinage was, as Linders (1987.117) states, "a rare occurrence."

12 The tamiai "of Athena" handled these matters except for 434/3 to 406/5 and 386/5 to 347/6 when the tamiai "of the other gods" managed them. On these two boards of tamiai, see Harris, 1995.11–19 and Linders, 1975.

13 *IG* I^3 369 of 426/5 and 383 of 429/8 and II^2 1445–54, from 376/5 to 343/2.

14 For the deities see Linders, 1975.14–16, summarized in Hansen, 1980.164.

and Theseus, and also the Anakes, Aphrodite in the Gardens, Apollo Delios, Patroös, Pythios, and Zoster, Artemis Brauronia, Artemis Mounychia, Athena at the Palladion, Athena Pallenis, Dionysus, Ge Olympia, Hephaestus, Heracles of Cynosarges, Meter at Agrai, Poseidon of Sunium, the Twelve Gods, Zeus Olympios, and Zeus Polieus. The polis took responsibility for the protection and security of some of the portable property of these gods. Only one, that of Apollo Zoster, is possibly a deme cult. All the others are, from other evidence, demonstrably polis cults.[15] These are cults whose resources of cash and precious objects the polis thought it could collect, protect, borrow from in emergency situations, and then repay with interest. The polis managed these collected resources, but there is no evidence that this management was extended to the internal operations of each cult.[16] The polis was obviously in control, but, again, primarily in financial matters, and there is no indication that the polis by this means controlled their priests, priestesses, local cultic officials, or rituals.

For "the prosecution of crimes of a religious nature," Garland describes the Ekklesia's involvement in crimes of theft of sanctuary property, *asebeia*, and atheism, and misconduct in connection with certain religious festivals (79–80).[17] These festivals included the City Dionysia, Lenaia, Thargelia, Eleusinian Mysteries, and the Dionysia at Piraeus, all polis festivals (vs. deme and private festivals). The cults of the deities involved in those remanded by the Ekklesia to trial for *asebeia* are the *herms* of the Agora, the Eleusinian Mysteries, and "the gods of the polis" in general, as in Socrates' case. Again, the Demos, i.e., the Ekklesia, seems to involve itself only in polis cults in regard to crimes committed.

Most interesting in terms of what the Demos could do versus what it did do was its power to initiate. We have seen, and Garland gives further examples (78), the Ekklesia's role in marking out, preserving, and adjusting the boundaries of sanctuaries, both old and new, both, apparently, public and private. It also had sole authority to grant the requests and initiate the procedures by which new cults, as that of Bendis or Isis, could gain the right to practice (*ierosis*) and to acquire land for their sanctuaries (*enktesis*).[18] Most known cults introduced in this way were of foreigners (Thracians for Bendis, Egyptians for Isis,

15 For the evidence, see Linders, 1975.14–16 and references in our text to the individual deities.

16 Hansen, 1980.164–5.

17 On procedures for the last, see Hansen, 1987.117. See also Parker, 2005.91.

18 On matters concerning the introduction of new gods, see Garland, 1992. On the procedures, pp. 19–22. For a good, brief survey of the topic, see Anderson, 2015.

and Citians for Aphrodite).[19] The cult of Asclepius, introduced in 420/19, was initially probably private but then, like the cult of Bendis, made statewide.[20] It is not clear whether Athenian citizens needed approval to introduce a new cult, i.e., a private cult on their own property, as Themistocles did for Artemis Aristoboule, Plato did for the Muses, and Dionysius did for his Dionysus in Piraeus.[21] Themistocles, of course, ran into trouble for doing so, but perhaps for political rather than religious reasons. The initiative in this area allowed the Ekklesia, in terms of boundaries, to settle some religious versus religious or religious versus secular disputes, and, in terms of new cults, to select among foreign influences.

Another important initiative detailed by Garland was the Ekklesia's authority to appeal to Delphi in religious matters, that is, by a *psephisma* to order the asking of divine approval for whatever innovation or change it was planning.[22] It did so most famously in the matter of the names of the ten new tribal heroes in the time of Cleisthenes, and it did so also for the new cults of Bendis and Isis. But the record of appeals to Delphi, as described in Chapter 8, suggests that the Ekklesia did this infrequently and, again, primarily in regard to polis cults, as concerning the Eleusinian *aparche* and, a rare instance after late IV BC, the remodeling of Apollo cults in 129/8.

The Demos also by a *psephisma* could decide to send again or for the first time a *theoria* to a festival held in another city, as the Pythaïs to Delphi and the *theoriai* to Zeus of Nemea or Zeus of Dodona.[23]

Of major importance is the Ekklesia's power of initiative in ordering new sacrifices, new *heortai* and *pompai*, and in the making of dedications. We can include under "dedications" virtually everything "given" to the individual gods by the polis as a whole: temples like the Erechtheum and Parthenon for Athena Polias, altars and other buildings built at polis expense in sanctuaries of polis deities, statues like the Athena Parthenos and Promachos, perhaps also the 1/60 of the tribute the Athenians took in every year under their empire,[24] and many more such things. Such gifts to the gods are far too numerous to catalogue here, but we offer some examples.

---

19 For the Citians, *IG* II^3 337.

20 Garland, 1992.116–35.

21 Artemis Aristoboule, Garland, 1992.73–8; Muses, Mikalson, 1998.64–5; and Dionysus, *ibid.* 204–6.

22 On this see also Parker, 2005.90.

23 Pythaïs, *FD* 3.2.27.4–6; Zeus of Nemea, Dem. 21.115; and Zeus of Dodona, Hyp. 4.24–5.

24 Meyer, 2013.468–9.

The majority of new polis sacrifices and votive and thank dedications appear associated especially with military victories, and they must have come from the initiative of the Demos as expressed in the Ekklesia.[25] Among the more famous new sacrifices resulting from a vow is the sacrifice of goats to Artemis, to be in equal number to the number of Persians the Athenians might kill at Marathon, but, after thousands of Persians were killed, the number of goats sacrificed was limited in practice to 500 each year. For 406 there are the vow and rewards to Zeus, Apollo, and the Erinyes concerning the battle of Arginusae.[26] To votive offerings we may add "thank-offerings," given after the victory but not promised before it. Such is the earliest known dedication of the profits of a war, from the war against the Boeotians and Chalcidians, a bronze four-horse chariot dedicated by "the sons of the Athenians."[27] Dem. 19.272 claims that the Athenians "dedicated" the Athena Promachos from the money which they received from their allies in the Persian Wars as an ἀριστεῖον. The thank-offering after a victory might consist of a tithe of the booty taken or of a dedication financed by that tithe. Pausanias (1.28.2) terms the Athena Promachos and the bronze chariot from the victory over the Boeotians and Chalcidians "tithes" (δεκάται), and Diodorus (11.62.3) describes the tithe given by Athenians to Apollo after the battle at the Eurymedon among several dedications they made at Delphi following the Persian Wars: statues of Apollo and Athena, of their eponymous heroes, and of the strategos Miltiades; the treasury of the Athenians; a bronze palm tree and a statue of Athena; and golden shields.[28] The Athenians also dedicated in their own sanctuaries, surely through the acts of the Ekklesia, weapons captured in warfare, like the breastplate of Masistius and the dagger of Mardonius after the battle of Plataea in 479 or the spear butt taken on the Lesbos campaign and dedicated to the

25 Pritchett (1971 and 1979) has collected from literary and epigraphical sources such sacrifices and dedications from throughout the Greek world and offers valuable background on the practices in general.

26 Marathon, Xen. *Ana*. 3.2.12, Plut. *Mor*. 862c, Pritchett, 1979.232; Arginusae, Diod. S. 13.102.2 and Pritchett, 1979.233. For such vows in military situations, see Pritchett, 1979.230–9. By R&O #41, a *psephisma*, the Ekklesia orders the herald to make a vow publicly, promising Zeus Olympios, Athena Polias, Demeter and Kore, the Twelve Gods, and the Semnai sacrifices and a *pompe* if a treaty is successful. On this text and the deities involved, see Parker, 2005.406. Pritchett (1979.234–5) suggests the usual procedure for such vows.

27 *IG* I^3 501. On this see Meyer, 2013.465–6 and M&L #15.

28 Pausanias, 10.10.1, 11.5, 15.4, and 19.4. On the many dedications made by the victorious Greeks after the Persian Wars, see Mikalson, 2003.98–104, 108–10.

Dioscouroi in 428/7.[29] It is impossible to know how many of the hundreds of gold, silver, and other dedications stored on the Acropolis in IV BC were or resulted from war booty. The Demos is rarely listed as the dedicator in the inventories,[30] but then the dedicator is not named for many of the dedications. One major group of such dedications is the gold crowns awarded to the Athenians by other poleis. These were stored in the Parthenon and were no doubt dedicated routinely by the Demos to Athena.[31] Noteworthy also are the two statue bases at Eleusis dedicated for unknown reasons by the Demos to the "two goddesses" (*IG* II^2 2795 and 2795a).

To the vows above we may add those which the herald was occcasionally ordered to make if an undertaking turned out "beneficial" to the Athenians, such as the sacrifice to the Twelve Gods, the Semnai, and Heracles for the sending out of kleruchs to Potidaea in 362/1 (*IG* II^2 114) and that to Zeus Olympios, Athena Polias, and Demeter and Kore for an alliance with the Arcadians, Achaeans, Eleans, and Phleiasians in that same year (R&O #41.2–12).[32]

We may also view temples as dedications.[33] Under the Demos' control seems to have been the proposal, the design, and the costs of the temples and other structures which adorned the sanctuaries of polis deities. Several, but certainly not all, temples in Athens were financed largely by spoils of war or revenues from the empire,[34] but it was the Ekklesia that made the final decisions to use such monies for temples and altars and such things of the polis deities.[35]

Most of our examples of polis-initiated new sacrifices and major dedications come from the fifth century. That is in good part because after the fifth

29 Masistius and Mardonius, Paus. 1.27.1; Lesbian spear butt, *Hesp*. 47.192. For a discussion of the practice of dedicating captured armor and numerous examples, see Pritchett, 1979.277–95.

30 E.g., *IG* II^2 1425.131–2 of a gold crown. For a list of the eight specifically Demos-dedications in the inventories, see Harris, 1995.150.

31 E.g., IG II^2 1443.89–123. For a list of all thirty-two surviving entries, see Harris, 1995.251. See Dem. 24.180–1 for more and for the Athenians' pride in these.

32 Cf. *Agora* 16.41.1–4 of 387/6.

33 Meyer (2013.466 n. 60): "The Periclean buildings were not specifically inscribed as dedications or gifts (Plut. *Per*. 14) but were, like other unlabeled votives, perceived as such, see Dem. 22.76 (ἀναθημάτων)." On various possible reasons for a *polis* or individual to build a temple, see Burkert, 1996. For him "the temple is the most prestigious and costly *anathema*" (p. 24).

34 Pritchett, 1971.100: "Without wars, few of the temples and other sacred buildings of Greece would have been built."

35 For the Demos' control over the proposal, design, and costs of the temples and other structures which adorned the sanctuaries of polis deities, see Rhodes, 1972.122–7.

century the Athenians were no longer winning wars or even major battles (the most common motivation for making the sacrifices and dedications) or obtaining the booty from victory (the money for the dedications). One example, notable for its isolation in IV BC and later, is the sacrifices and *pompai* in celebration for a victory over Philip in 339 (Dem. 18.216–18), a year before the decisive defeat at Chaeronea.[36] These sacrifices are reminiscent of the one-time sacrifices which Archinus proposed in 403/2 for the patriots who marched from Phyle and eventually overthrew the Thirty Tyrants and restored the democracy (Aeschines 3.187). In the fourth century, after Chaeronea, the Athenians established a new *heorte*, for the god Amphiaraus in their newly acquired land, and in ca. 224 they instituted, for largely political purposes, a new *heorte* to honor Ptolemy III Euergetes, the Ptolemaia.[37] Apart from those initiatives, in the fourth century and thereafter the Athenians seem only to have tinkered with existing polis cults—repairing sanctuaries and dedications, adding an altar here or there, refurbishing some cults, as of Apollo in 129/8, and refining rules governing individual cults.[38] They no longer had the occasions or the resources for the type of new sacrifices and dedications characteristic of the fifth century.

The Demos, through the Boule, also showed a natural concern for and regularly received reports from the prytaneis on the omens of sacrifices they made before meetings of the Ekklesia to Apollo Prostaterios and Artemis Boulaia and related gods. They also received occasional reports from the priest of Asclepius on his sacrifices "for the health and safety of the Boule and the Demos of Athenians." At least once, but not at all commonly it appears, they received such reports on sacrifices from an archon, a demarch of Eleusis in 165/4, the epimeletai of the Mysteries, an agonothetes of the City Dionysia, a priest of Amphiaraus, a priest of Zeus Soter of the Stoa of Zeus, a priest of Zeus Soter of Piraeus and the epimeletai, a priest of Dionysus in Piraeus and the hieropoioi, theoroi, a priestess of Athena Polias, a priestess of Aglauros, and a strategos.[39]

---

36 Somewhat unusual are the sacrifices instituted "on behalf of those who were campaigning" to Athena Nike, Agathe Tyche, and the Soteres (here Antigonus Monophthalmus and Demetrius Poliorcetes) that the Athenians made in 304/3 (*Agora* 16.114). Normally such sacrifices are the results of vows or thank-offerings, not for the welfare of those on campaigns. This might be put down as another of the distortions of Athenian religious practices under the influence of Antigonus and Demetrius, for which see Mikalson, 1998.75–104.

37 See Mikalson, 1998.108, 179–81, and 275.

38 Lycurgus, who from 336/5–324 devoted significant polis funds to religious purposes, concentrated almost exclusively on existing cults. See Mikalson, 1998.11–45 and 288–94.

39 For these, see Chapter 4.

These may seem numerous, but given the time period and the corpus of honorary decrees, they are relatively few. Also, all concern polis cults.

Finally, we add another initiative, important for this study, that the Ekklesia had and exercised the right to "honor" those who performed religious activities. Through honorary decrees, through the public proclamation and publishing of the honors, and through the inscriptions, dedications, and statues that resulted,[40] the polis was able to publicize and reward the efforts they approved of and thus to shape the religious behavior of individuals into the form that the polis as a whole, as represented by the Ekklesia, wished. They could induce individuals into doing their religious duties better, more beautifully, and, sometimes perhaps, more generously, and they did this only for polis, not private, cults.[41]

The authority of the Demos over priests and priestesses has been, I think, overstated in modern scholarship. Garland (1990.86) claims that "it fixed the emoluments to which the individual priests and priestesses were entitled," and that the Demos "subjected both gentile and democratic priests to a financial audit at the expiry of their term of office." Each claim, properly understood, is correct, but it has been wrongly expanded by others to general polis control over all priests and priestesses in Athens.[42]

The claim that the Demos "fixed the emoluments" for priests and priestess is usually based on *IG* I^3 35, a *psephisma* which deals with, among other things, the selection by lot of the priestess of Athena Nike "from all Athenian women," the payment to her of 50 drachmas,[43] and the awarding to her of "the legs and skins of the polis (sacrifices) (τὸν δεμοσίον)." The Demos clearly had the authority to make such determinations, but did it do so regularly? Here the special circumstances of this document, dated ca. 448–424, may come into

40 As, for example, the pillar honoring the priest Aristocrates (*IG* II^2 3454) or two statue bases from Eleusis which honor individuals for, among other things, having been epimeletai of the Mysteries (*I. Eleusis* 186 and 286). On these see Perrin-Saminidayar, 2012.137.

41 For a more general formulation of this, not just in terms of religious matters, and with abundant bibliography, see Meyer, 2013.485–8 and Lambert, 2011. For honorary decrees stimulating desirable political activity, see Hansen, 1987.114–15. Luraghi (2010.250) offers a nice summary, from another viewpoint: "The social approval expressed by the honours was the result of fulfilling publicly articulated norms of behavior."

42 E.g., Wohl, 1996.63, "The powerlessness of the gentile priests against the ever-increasing control of the demos over ritual." On many of these issues, but from a different viewpoint and sometimes with different conclusions, see Parker, 2005.90–9.

43 A provision restated about twenty years later (*IG* I^3 36), indicating that it was probably an annual payment.

play.[44] It may mark the transition of this most important polis priesthood from the control of a *genos* to the polis as a whole, and hence the need to state the conditions of employment. And this statement concerns only financial—the portions of the victims had real monetary value—, not ritual matters. Better evidence comes from the Athenian State Calendar of sacrifices (*SEG* 52.48) which, revised by Nicomachus, survives in numerous fragments re-edited in 2002 by Stephen Lambert. There, amidst the listing of days, deities, victims, and costs there are, occasionally, indicated *hierosyna* and *apometra*, both apparently cash payments or things able to be given a cash value, sometimes with the priest or priestess to receive them named, for example, frag. 6A1. 1–3, "To priestess of Athena Polias, *apometra*."[45] Here the polis, as it were, "fixed" these payments by a *psephisma* approving the new calendar and by engraving them on stone, but there is no indication of who or what group first "established" them. That probably varied from cult to cult. And, also, the primary purpose of the calendar is financial, to "fix" the various costs of the sacrifices of the polis.[46] Here again we have an expression of the Demos' power to order polis religious affairs, but doing so primarily in financial matters.

The same might be said of the financial audits of priests. But of which priests? Aeschines 3.17–18 has been taken to mean *all* priests in Attica, but I think that is incorrect.

> In this city, which is so ancient and great in magnitude, no one is free from audit, no one of those who in any way have entered into public affairs. And I will teach you this first in the unexpected cases. For example, the *nomos* orders that priests and priestesses be subject to audit, all together and each separately, those who receive only γέρα and pray to the

44 *IG* I^3 35.9–11 and 36 (for Aleshire's mistaken 34).4–7 are likewise the only evidence Aleshire (1994.15) offers that the polis "often paid priestly salaries." It gives the wrong impression to conclude from a "house" of the priestess at Eleusis (*I. Eleusis* 177.74, 127, 293) that "in some cases [the state] provided priestly housing" (Aleshire, 1994.15). Eleusis and its cults were very much the exception.

45 ἱερώσυνα ("priestly things") and ἀπόμετρα ("shares" or "distributions") are distinct in these texts. Although the texts are too fragmentary and laconic to allow any real conclusions, it may be noteworthy that for ἀπόμετρα specific priestesses are designated as recipients, for ἱερώσυνα no recipients are designated. This might suggest that ἱερώσυνα are to cover priests' expenses beyond that of the victim, whereas ἀπόμετρα are truly the priestly perquisites or emoluments, usually (the value of) the parts of the victims awarded to them. On these see Lambert, 2002.398–9.

46 Lambert, 2002.357: "The financial aspect of this sacrificial calendar was patently fundamental." Cf. Parker, 1996.51–3.

> gods on your behalf. And not only privately, but also the *gene* together, the Eumolpidae and Kerykes and all the others.[47]

The context of this comment is a courtroom speech, in front of a jury made up of a representative sample of the Athenian Demos. Aeschines speaks of priests who "pray to gods on your behalf," and the "your" there refers to not just the jurors but to the Demos of Athenians they represent. This whole passage is best taken as referring to priests and priestesses of polis cults, minimally all such priests and priestesses who administer polis funds or receive perquisites paid for by the polis.[48] "Privately" would indicate the priests individually. Interesting here is the marking out of those priests who were selected from *gene* but served polis cults.[49] For their financial misdeeds their *gene* as well as the individuals themselves were held responsible. One should not, I believe, conclude from this passage that *all* priests and priestesses in Attica, of deme cults, of private associations, and such were subject to polis audits.[50]

---

47 ἐν γὰρ ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει, οὕτως ἀρχαίᾳ οὔσῃ καὶ τηλικαύτῃ τὸ μέγεθος, οὐδείς ἐστιν ἀνυπεύθυνος τῶν καὶ ὁπωσοῦν πρὸς τὰ κοινὰ προσεληλυθότων. διδάξω δ' ὑμᾶς πρῶτον ἐπὶ τῶν παραδόξων. οἷον τοὺς ἱερέας καὶ τὰς ἱερείας ὑπευθύνους εἶναι κελεύει ὁ νόμος, καὶ συλλήβην ἅπαντας καὶ χωρὶς ἑκάστους κατὰσῶμα, τοὺς τὰ γέρα μόνον λαμβάνοντας καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐχομένους, καὶ οὐ μόνον ἰδίᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ κοινῇ τὰ γένη, Εὐμολπίδας καὶ Κήρυκας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας.

48 Aleshire (1994.15) draws, I think, the correct conclusion here: "At the end of each year the priests and priestesses of those cults whose financial affairs were under the control of the demos were required to submit their accounts to the boule and demos for εὔθυνα." The priest of Kalliste, for whom such λόγοι are attested, was following the *nomoi* (*IG* II^2 788.13–15 of 243/2). It may be relevant that this priesthood was annual.

49 For a list of gennetai priests and priestesses serving the cults of Athena Polias, Poseidon Erechtheus, and Demeter of Eleusis, see Blok and Lambert, 2009.105–20.

50 The epigraphical evidence suggests that such *euthynai* from priests were not common. One is expected from a priest of Asclepius (*IG* II^3 359.21–2), but the several texts honoring other priests of Asclepius make no mention of it. *IG* II^3 416 involves a unique situation, with priests of four gods in Piraeus and with ten hieropoioi honored, all of whom, apparently, were to render *euthynai*. This looks to be an *ad hoc* commission of priests and hieropoioi involved in a survey (?) and sacrifices of major polis cults in Piraeus, centering on that of Dionysus but including others. For possible circumstances, see Lambert, 2012.92–5. Naiden (2013.210–11) offers to support his claim that "Athenian priests were subject to *euthunai*" only, in addition to Aeschin. 3.18, *SEG* 33.147.12 where there is no explicit mention of a priest and which is, in any case, a deme calendar. For more on the financial audits of priests in Athens, and on how exceptional it was in the Greek world, see Fröhlich, 2004.331, 337, 344, 352, and 399–400. Deme priests probably rendered their

That priests and priestesses of polis cults were subject to audits leads some to assume much broader polis control over them. Harris (2012.289), for example, claims "all the priests and priestesses of public cults were accountable for their conduct to the political authorities," but he does not define what he means by "conduct."[51] Surely for their handling of polis funds, but, beyond that, what? The priest of Asclepius often and a few other priests and priestesses rarely reported to the Boule and Demos that the omens were good in sacrifices they made on behalf of the Boule and Demos,[52] but that is hardly "regulation" or "control" of their conduct. And there is no evidence that the polis "controlled" or tried to "control" the rituals in which priests and priestesses engaged.[53] Polis oversight of the polis priests was, as it was in so many religious matters, largely limited to financial affairs.[54]

In one notable instance, and perhaps two, the Demos in 415 clearly ordered all the priests and priestesses (of Eleusis) to curse Alcibiades and possibly Andocides for their profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[55] The Demos later, in 408, ordered the Eumolpidae and Kerykes to revoke this curse, but the hierophant refused, saying he had not prayed for any evil for Alcibiades if Alcibiades were commiting no injustice.[56]

Finally, it should be noted that whether the priests of a given cult were selected by the *genos* in charge of it or by lot (the only two options), the Demos had no control in either format of selection of the specific individual to serve.

In concluding this treatment of the religious authority of the Ekklesia and the Demos, we make the following general points, subject to the exceptions noted in previous pages.

Except for the initial approval of importation of foreign cults, the Demos through the Ekklesia exercised its power only over polis cults. We see the polis

---

accounts, when they did, only to fellow demesmen, as in R&O #46.6. But note Parker, 205.59 n. 35.

51 Cf. Naiden (2015.467), "Officials performing sacrifices were subject to *euthynai*, or audit."

52 See Chapter 4.

53 Parker (1996.51–2) tellingly contrasts Greek texts to near-eastern ritual texts in this regard.

54 Cf. Naiden (2013.217), "the polis did not issue instructions about how to pray, and so it could not punish any violations. For this aspect of *thusia*, the polis trusted the priest or magistrate. Similarly, the polis did not issue instructions about how to inspect entrails or perform hepatoscopy. . . ."

55 Plut. *Alc*. 22.4 and [Lys.] 6.51. In Alcibiades' case, one Eleusinian priestess may have refused, because, she said, she was a priestess of prayer not of curse (Plut. *Mor*. 275d). On this event see, most recently, Rubel, 2014.74–98 with extensive bibliography.

56 Plut. *Alc*. 33.3.

courts settling some disputes on religious matters between *gene* and demes,[57] but we see no other day-to-day or year-to-year concern or activity at the polis level involving deme, tribe, *genos*, family, or foreign cults.

As Aleshire noted (1994.10), the polis might control one aspect of a cult without controlling the whole cult, and this varied from cult to cult. The polis paid and often through alloted or elected officials supervised the financial costs of several elements, including those of sacrificial victims, of *agones* of major *heortai*, and of such things, but, so far as we can tell, the sacrifices and rituals remained in the control of the priests. *IG* II^2 47 and 4962 offer a unique opportunity to see both elements at play in one situation. Euthydemus, priest of the sanctuary of Asclepius in Piraeus, in early IV BC erected *stelai* in the sanctuary there describing the *prothymata* which he personally prescribed to be made to Maleates, Apollo, Hermes, Iaso, Akeso, Panakeia, and "the hunters," i.e., offerings "preliminary" to those to be made to Asclepius (*IG* II^2 4962).[58] The Demos then passed a *psephisma* (*IG* II^2 47), not validating or approving of Euthydemus' *prothymata*, but specifying how they "and the other sacrifice" would be paid for ("from the quarry") and how the meat of the sacrifices should be distributed to government officials and the public. And the record of its *psephisma* was erected on the Acropolis, not in the sanctuary in Piraeus. The priest specifies the deities and the nature of the offerings; the Demos decides on the financing and here, perhaps because prytaneis and archons were involved, on the distribution of the meat.

---

57 As in Lycurg. frag. 7 [Conomis] and Din. frag. 20 [Conomis]. Naiden (2013.210 and 219–22) claims that non-polis groups and associations, including religious ones, collected the fines they levied through polis courts and depended on the polis for legal help. "Recourse to the courts of the polis goes without saying." This would be a major interaction of the polis and private religious associations. But the relevant evidence Naiden cites refers only to disputes between *gene* and demes. The δικασταί mentioned in *IG* II^2 1289.3 may well be "judges" of the association's own choosing, not those of the polis courts. The *nomos* of Solon (Ruschenbusch, #76a) indicates only that a *thiasos*, like several secular organizations, may make whatever arrangement it wishes, and it "will be valid unless it contravenes polis regulations." This would seem the extent of the legal intervention of the polis in the internal operations of thiasotai and orgeones. One should not conclude from this *nomos*, with Naiden, that "the polis, in turn, would support the bylaws" (of the association).

58 "Prescribed" does not accurately reflect the Greek ἐξηικάσατο of line 17, a *hapax* which would apparently mean something like "made images of," presumably on the lost portion of the *stele*, also a very unusual concept. I suspect there may be an error here: ἐξηικάσατο for ἐξηγέσατο (as in *IG* II^2 47.26). But on this and on both these texts and their relationship, see Lamont, 2015.41 and 43–4.

Almost all Demos control of sacrifices and of religious activities in general focused on finances—on the cost of the sacrificial victims and the emoluments of priests and priestesses, on the costs of the *agones*, the costs of buildings, the maintenance and repair of dedications, and such things.

Through audits the Demos reviewed the financial activities of polis priests and priestesses who handled polis funds, but seems not to have reviewed or controlled their handling of ritual or of internal, non-financial matters of the sanctuary. Although for some new polis cults established from the mid-fifth century on priests and priestesses were selected through the procedures of the Ekklesia, the vast majority of priests and priestesses, and most of those of the most important cults, continued to be selected κατὰ τὰ πάτρια by the *gene* or other social/political groups.[59]

The Demos involved itself in the prosecution of cases of ἀσέβεια and other cases of religious misbehavior, but only in those involving polis deities.

The Demos was heavily involved in ordering, designing, and paying for buildings in sanctuaries of polis deities and in making major dedications as the result of vows and as thank-offerings, particularly after military victories and successful wars. It also felt at liberty, for a least a hundred years or so, to borrow in times of financial crisis money and gold and silver dedications from some polis sanctuaries, with the intent to repay all such borrowings.

Through its many honorary decrees the polis was able to encourage what it deemed to be individuals' appropriate religious behavior that benefited the polis as a whole.

In sum, the Athenian Demos, to quote Aleshire (1994.14) "regulates the form and the finances of cult—the externals, if you will, but not the content, which is governed in large part by tradition and interpreted by priests. . . ." That is, in our terms, by τὰ πάτρια as interpreted and performed by the priests and priestesses.[60]

---

59 Cf. Aleshire (1994.10): "The Athenian Demos was content to delegate most or all of the supervision of these cults to those directly concerned, even to the extent of allowing the Kleisthenic tribes to delegate the selection of the priests of their eponymous heroes to those who had traditionally controlled these priesthoods." I would quibble here only with the term "delegate," which would suggest a conscious, specific, perhaps even legislative action. Better, I think, is "did not involve itself in." Here, again, the Demos no doubt had the right to make changes (as it did for the priestess of Athena Polias), or to take control, but in the vast majority of cases did not do so.

60 Aleshire (1994.14) adds to the interpreters exegetai and *manteis*, which, in contrast to priests and other cult officials, must have played a very occasional role in determining the content of cult.

The Boule

The attested religious responsibilities and activities of the Boule as an institution, i.e., not of individual bouleutai, have been studied well and extensively, especially by Rhodes (1972, especially 127–134 and 1993), and we can review them here summarily. The Boule, of course, prepared motions (*probouleumata*) for the *psephismata* passed by the Ekklesia and must therefore have had an interest in the religious elements of those *psephismata*.[61] As one example among the many we have seen, in 221/0 when the priest of Heros Iatros wished to remake numerous silver dedications of body parts into one oenochoe, he personally proposed it to the Boule. The Boule then prepared a motion for the Ekklesia, which, when passed, became a *psephisma* to approve the project and designated and elected the committee to bring it to completion. Here, unusually, the new oenochoe was to be inscribed "The Boule in the archonship of Thrasyphon from the dedications to Heros Iatros (dedicated this)."[62] The Boule, apparently, made the oenochoe its own dedication.[63]

The Boule received and forwarded to the Ekklesia some reports of sacrifices and omens from prytaneis (on sacrifices to Apollo Prostaterios and associated deities), priests or priestesses of Asclepius, Aglauros, Amphiaraus, Athena Polias, Zeus Soter, Dionysus and the hieropoioi from Piraeus, an agonothetes of the City Dionysia, epimeletai of the Mysteries, and a strategos.[64] The purpose of such sacrifices was usually for "the health and safety of the Boule and Demos of Athenians," i.e., among other things, for the Boule's own "health and safety," in which it had, of course, a special interest. All of these reports derive from polis cult.

For Athena Polias the Boule was involved in oversight of her dedications and treasures (*Ath. Pol.* 47.1)[65] and, at least in part, in the approval of the design of her *peplos* (49.3);[66] for Athena Nike in the making of the *nikai* (49.3), in the repair of her statue (*IG* II^3 444), and in financial and other details of the

---

61 Andocides reportedly advised the Boule concerning sacrifices, revenues, prayers, and oracles ([Lysias] 6.33).

62 *IG* II^3 1154. Cf. *IG* II^2 840.

63 Analogous is the situation described in Dem. 22.69–78, where Androtion, then epimeletes for cleaning gold crowns in the polis treasury, removed the names of the original honorands and substituted the phrase "when Androtion was epimeletes." See above, p. 34, note 90.

64 See Chapter 4.

65 As it was for all the sacred treasures stored on the Acropolis. For this see Rhodes, 1972.91–3. For an example, see *IG* I^3 92A = M&L #58.

66 On this see Rhodes, 1993.568–9. Approval of the *peplos* was later transferred to a *dikasterion*.

construction of her new temple (*IG* I^3 64); and for Pythian Apollo in providing theoroi for his Pythia in Delphi (Dem. 19.128). For the City Dionysia and, apparently, similar festivals, the Boule prepared a short list of possible judges for the musical and dramatic contests (Isoc. 17.33–4)[67] and, after the *heorte*, held a meeting in the theater to review matters of misbehavior (*IG* II^3 306.21–5).[68] For the quadrennial Panathenaia they collaborated with the agonothetai and the tamias of the stratiotic fund in making the prize amphoras (*Ath. Pol.* 49.3 and 60.1). And for the Delia, Brauronia, Herakleia, Eleusinia, and Amphiaraia they selected, by sortition, the hieropoioi (*Ath. Pol.* 54.7). They also apparently selected the architheoros for the Athenian *theoria* to the quadrennial festival at Olympia (Din. 1.82). The Boule as a group was heavily involved in the Eleusinian Mysteries, for which see Appendix 7, but as examples it met as a group in Eleusis during the celebration of the Mysteries and in the Eleusinion in the city on the day after the Mysteries.[69] For the cult of Apollo Lykeios and for one of Meter the Boule selected from its own members two to serve as tamiai.[70] Each of the gods and *heortai* listed here, we must note, is necessarily or likely of a polis cult, not that of a deme, family, or private association.

There were sacrifices and prayers by the Boule to Zeus Boulaios and Athena Boulaia before their meetings, with an additional purification ceremony.[71] The herald also pronounced curses on various imagined enemies of the polis.[72] Either at the beginning of their term or before each meeting the bouleutai sacrificed *eisiteteria*, with one member serving as hieropoios.[73] And they apparently regularly performed sacrifices and prayers when they, as a group, visited sanctuaries, perhaps at Eleusis and at the theater of Dionysus (Antiph. 6.45). Once an *aresteria* was sacrificed to Demeter and Kore at Eleusis, ordered by a *psephisma* of the Boule in 329/8 (*I. Eleusis* 177.431–2). *I. Eleusis* 142 of 353/2 reveals that the Boule to some extent supervised the performance of the annual ἀπαρχαί of grain to Eleusis and also supervised the sacrifices made there on behalf of the Demos.[74]

---

67 For the possible procedure, see Rhodes, 1972.131 and Pickard-Cambridge, 1988.95–8.

68 On this see Pickard-Cambridge, 1988.69–70.

69 At Eleusis, *IG* II^2 1072.3; in Eleusinion, Andoc. 1.111.

70 *IG* I^3 138 of before, apparently, 434.

71 Parker, 1983.21–2.

72 Rhodes, 1972.36–7.

73 When the 400 seized power from the Boule in 411, they, "entering office, made sacrifices and prayers" (Thuc. 8.70), clearly just as the bouleutai did when they began their terms.

74 For other sacrifices by bouleutai, see Chapter 3. At a different level the bouleutai from the deme Teithras supervised the sacrifices and other things which their fellow demesmen ordered (*Agora* 15.45).

For a time, mostly from mid- to end IV, with a very few earlier or later, the Boule or individual members occasionally erected dedications—really, of course, self-approbations—, after being crowned by the Demos for their excellent service. The recipients included the Twelve Gods, Hephaestus and Athena Hephaistia, Aphrodite Hegemone and the Charites, and Demokratia,[75] again all polis deities. Such also may have been the origin of the gold crowns which the Boule dedicated, probably to Athena, in 377/6, 376/5, 375/4, and 354/3.[76] The Boule also, like the Ekklesia, dedicated crowns given to it by foreign states (*IG* II^2 1443). Interesting are the ten cups, inscribed "of the eponymous (heroes)" dedicated by the Boule in 328/7 and another set of cups dedicated by the Boule later, all, apparently, the property of an anonymous hero.[77] The Boule also dedicated at Eleusis a silver *phiale* in 336/5, 334/3, and 333/2 (*IG* II^2 1544.47–50). Isolated but interesting are the dedications of an iron knife with an ivory scabbard in 407/6 and of a silver basket, to Athena, in 318/7.[78] Unusual is the dedication the Boule made for Amphiaraus in 328/7.[79] It was paid for not by the polis but privately by subscription by twenty-one members of the Boule, their tamias, and grammateis, and ten others.[80] The large majority of the attested dedications by the Boule are from IV BC, but this may result in part from the lack of temple inventories recording such dedications after that.

The Boule was heavily involved in the prosecution of the Hermocopidae and of those who profaned the Eleusinian Mysteries in 415. In both cases it appears that the Ekklesia commissioned the Boule to investigate the charges and that, eventually, the Boule forwarded its findings to the *dikasteria* for trial and punishment of the perpetrators.[81] We should not, though, conclude from this that the Boule regularly or normally involved itself in affairs of

75 *IG* II^3 360 and II^2 2790–2, 2797–8. Cf. 2801 and *Agora* 18.242.

76 *IG* II^2 1428.151–2; 1437.24–7; 1494.16–19 and 26–8. The link with being crowned by the Demos may be explicit in *IG* II^2 1496. Col. 1.18–20. For lists of the dedications explicitly made by the Boule in the inventories, see Harris, 1995.250–2.

77 *SEG* 29.146 frag. A, on which see Rotroff, 1978.

78 *IG* II^2 1494a.248–50 and 1474.10–14.

79 *I. Oropos* 299.

80 The tamias of the Boule had some religious duties. One such tamias "dispensed funds to the hieropoioi for victims for sacrifices and 'himself joined (the hieropoioi) in supervision,' sacrificing all the sacrifices" (*Agora* 15.85.12–15 of mid-III BC). In the reorganization of the Apollo cult in 129/8 the tamias of the Boule reported on existing oracles and psephismata concerning the cult and then, with the tamiai of the grain fund, was to sacrifice to Apollo (*SEG* 21.469C.15–17 and 58–9).

81 On the role of the Boule here and on the procedures, see Rhodes, 1972.186–8.

asebeia. Those fell to the basileus (*Ath. Pol.* 57.2), and a full survey of the administrative role of the Boule in religious matters and of the "punitive powers of the Boule" (Rhodes, 1972.127–34 and 179–207) offers no further examples of involvement by the Boule.

Like the Ekklesia, the Boule was primarily involved in the finances and administrative side of cult activities, although it occasionally made its own dedications and at its own meetings and occasionally elsewhere made its own sacrifices. Importantly, though, all of its attested responsibilities and activities concerned only polis cults.

Prytanies

From the available evidence it would seem that the prytaneis had a greater involvement in day-to-day Athenian religion than any other legislative or administrative officials. For the one-tenth (or one-eleventh, or one-twelfth) of the year they were in full-time service, they, or better, their tamias, made the sacrifices to Apollo Prostaterios and related gods that preceded the four meetings of the Ekklesia during their term. They then reported to the Boule the results of these sacrifices "on behalf of the health and safety of the Boule and Demos of Athenians. . . ."[82]

The pyrtaneis also sacrificed to several major deities of the polis whose annual *heortai* or sacrifices occurred during their prytany, to Athena Archegetis at the Chalkeia, to Demeter and Kore at the Stenia, to the Mother of the Gods at the Galaxia, to Zeus at the Kronia, to Theseus, probably at the Theseia, and to Apollo Patroös, Zeus Ktesios, and Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira.[83] They received five portions (one-tenth of a portion for each prytanis) from the sacrifices to Athena in the annual Panathenaia and, at a *heorte* of Asclepius, a portion of the meat of the leading bull.[84] But even these sacrifices cover by no means the range of polis sacrifices. Of the nine festivals and six sacrifices recorded on the dermaticon accounts of *IG* II^2 1496 from 334/3–331/0, the prytaneis are attested to have sacrificed only at the Theseia and to Zeus Soter. They seem not to have sacrificed at some of the largest festivals like the City Dionysia where the polis was represented by other officials. There seems to be no common denominator in the cults at which they sacrificed except that they were all cults of major deities with polis-wide concerns and the cults

82 See Chapters 3 and 4.

83 See Chapter 3.

84 *IG* II^3 447.35–6 of 335–330 and II^2 47.35–8 of mid-IV BC.

were centered "in the city," not in Piraeus or in the countryside. However all that may be, the prytaneis represented the Boule, the Boule represented the Ekklesia, and the Ekklesia represented the Demos, the people, and through the prytaneis the Demos as a unit was represented at specifically these sacrifices. In each case we might imagine the prytaneis' sacrifice as an "accessory sacrifice," accessory to the major sacrifice made, no doubt, by the appropriate priests and priestesses. Only here, at the prytany level, do we find such a clearly systematic attempt by the government to participate in sacrifices to a number of deities. And here, nicely, we have evidence from Antiphon and Theophrastus for the pride some individual prytaneis took in their role in such activities, as described in Chapter 3.[85]

A long series of dedications honoring the members of the prytany which had been judged best to have served the interests of the polis that year ranges from 408/7 to 307/6.[86] They were awarded by the Boule and/or the Ekklesia, but the monument may have been paid for by the prytaneis themselves. Most were found in the Agora, but at least one may have been erected in the sanctuary of that tribe's eponymous hero.[87] They are dedications, but their primary purpose is to honor humans for their accomplishments and they make only secondary, if any, reference to the deity.[88] In this they are similar to archaic and classical "dedications" honoring victors in the various international competitions.[89] The later, long series of decrees honoring prytaneis for their efforts, beginning in 305/4, was erected near the Bouleuterion or Tholos, that is, not in a sanctuary. Here the slender tie with deities in the IV BC pyrtany "dedications" is completely broken. Of a quite different nature are the four dedications made by prytanies of individual tribes in 370/69, 363/2, 362/1, 361/0, each consisting of a serving tray for food (μαζονομεῖον), reasonably associated by Lewis with "eating and dining arrangements of the boule and its prytaneis."[90]

85 Antiph. 6.45 and Theophr. *Char*. 21.

86 Most of *Agora* 15.1–56. On these texts see *Agora* 15, p. 2.

87 *Agora* 18.80 (see also p. 313 there).

88 The deities are rarely named in these dedications. The exceptions are the eponymous heroes Leos (*Agora* 15.13 of 370/69 (?) and perhaps 18.80 of 348/7) and (restored) Erechtheus (15.6 of 381/0). Also found are Agathos Daimon (15.35.2 of 343/2) and (restored) Athena (15.1 of 408/7).

89 See Mikalson, 2007.

90 *SEG* 29.146 frag. B. See Lewis, 1979.

Boards Elected or Allotted by the Demos or the Boule

The Demos and Boule also exerted influence in the religious realm by the allotment or election of numerous boards, usually of ten members with one member from each tribe for one-year terms.[91] These boards sometimes had members from the Boule, sometimes not. By late IV BC they included the following:

1. the episkeuastai, ten men chosen by lot each year to "repair" those sanctuaries especially in need of repair (*Ath. Pol.* 50.1)
2. the boönai, officials who purchased the sacrificial victims for certain *heortai* (*IG* II^3 447.42–4)
3. the four epimeletai of the Mysteries, elected, two from all Athenians, one each from Eumolpidae and Kerykes (*Ath. Pol.* 57.1)
4. the epimeletai of the Amphiaraia, ten elected (*IG* II^3 355)
5. the epimeletai of the City Dionysia, ten, elected earlier but in Hellenistic period allotted (*Ath. Pol.* 56.4)
6. the epimeletai for Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira in the city (*Agora* 16.186.11–18)
7. the epimeletai of Asclepius in Piraeus (*IG* II^3 783)
8. the hieropoioi "for expiatory sacrifices," ten allotted (*Ath. Pol.* 54.6)
9. the hieropoioi "for the year" who were involved with the *theoria* to Delos, the Brauronia, the Herakleia, the Eleusinia, the Hephaisteia, and, after 329/8, possibly the Amphiaraia, ten, allotted (*Ath. Pol.* 54.7)
10. the hieropoioi of the Semnai, three, elected by the Areopagus Council (Dem. 21.115)[92]
11. the hieropoioi of the Hephaisteia, two boards of 10, allotted from bouleutai and dikastai (*IG* I^3 82)
12. the hieropoioi at Eleusis (*I. Eleusis* 28a.17–18 and 45. 10–11)[93]

---

91 I leave aside boards such as the annual tamai of Athena or the later tamiai of the other gods, annual boards which in V and IV BC saw to the preservation, inventorying, and management of sacred treasures, including dedications and cash. Often recorded were the transfer of these from one board of tamiai to the next, as, e.g., in the *Ath. Pol.*'s (47.1) description of the tamiai of Athena: "They receive, in the presence of the Boule, the statue (ἄγαλμα) of Athena, the Nikai, and the rest of the *kosmos* and the money." On these boards see Harris, 1995.

92 On whom see Lambert, 2002a.81–2 and Parker, 1996.298–9. Din., frag. A.4 [Burtt] indicates that they were ten in number.

93 For the hieropoioi of *IG* II^2 1749 being tribal, not polis, see Clinton, 1980.282. I think it most probable that the hieropoioi of Dionysus (and other gods?) in Piraeus of *IG* II^3 416 were an *ad hoc*, temporary commission.

So we have each year, at least, one board each of episkeuastai and boönai, five boards of epimeletai, and five boards of hieropoioi,[94] most consisting of ten members, nearly 130 citizens in all.

Episkeuastai

They were ten men, selected by lot each year, who "repaired" those sanctuaries especially in need of it. For this they received, in late IV BC, 3000 drachmas in polis funds (*Ath. Pol.* 50.1).

Boönai

The boönai were responsible for purchasing with polis funds the sacrificial victims for certain major *heortai*, probably including the Panathenaia and the Dionysia in Piraeus.[95]

Hieropoioi

The duties of the hieropoioi no doubt differed from cult to cult and from one period to another. *IG* I^3 82 of 421/0, though fragmentary, gives an extensive account of the hieropoioi for the new or remodeled quadrennial Hephaisteia. There are two boards, each of ten, one selected by lot from the dikastai, one man from each tribe, and one selected by lot from the bouleutai, one man again from each tribe. They are to be paid the bouleutic wage for their time of service. They are to distribute to the metics the meat, are to "oversee" the *pompe*, and are to fine (up to 50 drachmas) any who misbehave during the *heorte* and to bring to court any who deserve a greater penalty. They are to lead the cows to the altar and are to select from the citizens 200 to "lift" the victims. They are "to make" the torch race and the rest of the *agon*. They are to be present when the victors are announced and are to "oversee" the inscribing of the prizes. Similarly, ca. 335–300, in the reorganization of the annual Panathenaia (*IG* II^3 447) the hieropoioi are to receive the polis money for the *heorte*; to see to the *pompe*; to make two sacrifices, one to Athena Hygieia, and the other to, probably, Athena Polias; and to distribute the meat to various officials, the kanephoroi, those in the *pompe*, and "to the Athenians." They are to select and purchase the victims and then sacrifice to Athena on her Great Altar and to Athena Nike and to distribute the meat to "the Demos of the Athenians"

---

94 Hansen (1982.163–4) points out that in *IG* II^2 1496 are listed also sets of hieropoioi for a sacrifice to Agathe Tyche (76–7, 107–8), for the Asclepieia (78–9, 109–10), for the Bendideia (86–7), and for the Theseia (134–5). He notes, correctly, that some of these may be the hieropoioi "for the year," but some may be independent boards.

95 *IG* II^3 447.42–4 and *IG* II^2 1496.70–4, 80–1, 88–9, 118–19, and 133.

in the Cerameicus. They are also to make the *pannychis* and to fine "the one who does not obey the one in authority" (τὸν μὴ πειθαπχο[ῦντα].[96] In the years 334/3–331/0 the hieropoioi "for the year" also received revenues from the sale of skins of the victims at the Panathenaia, as well as at the Asclepieia, Bendideia, Eleusinia, Theseia, and the sacrifice to Agathe Tyche (*IG* II^2 1496). In this same text the syllogeis "of the Demos" received funds from the Olympieia. In the fourth century these syllogeis were apparently a board of thirty, with three bouleutai from each tribe, and in their dedication to the Mother of the Gods in 324/3, one was honored for serving as a hieropoios for Athena and one for Zeus Olympios.[97] Finally, in the Lycurgan period ten hieropoioi, including Lycurgus himself, "led" the Pythaïs to Delphi, but in 128/7 this task was performed by the nine archons.[98]

The hieropoioi are clearly, at least in IV BC, major figures in the administration of various aspects of the large polis *heortai*. For at least some such *heortai* they receive and dispense significant funds, select, purchase, and sometimes participate in the sacrifice of the victims, "put on" the *pompe* and *agones*, receive funds accrued from the sale of the skins of victims, and examine cases of misconduct during the *heorte*. They, in short, were responsible for much of what would, from the human point of view, make a *heorte* successful.[99] They apparently did not introduce new or make changes to old *heortai* (the role of the Demos) or have any control over the rituals (probably the role of the priests). As Rhodes (1972.130) concludes, "In general their duties seem to have covered those aspects of festival administration which were not the responsibility of the priests themselves." Our best evidence is from V and IV BC, and the establishment of the new role of the agonothetes at the end of IV BC may have restricted the future role of the hieropoioi in administering the *agones* of major *heortai*.[100] Given that they functioned as a board and had one-year

96 These hieropoioi are either the "hieropoioi for the year" (Lambert, 2012a.84) or, less likely, a separate group of "hieropoioi for the Panathenaia" (Shear. 2001.104–5 and 451–5).

97 *IG* II^2 1496.82–3 and 113–14 and Schwenk #77. On the syllogeis, see Rhodes, 1972.21 and 129–30.

98 *FD* 3.1.511 and 3.2.3.

99 One would hesitate to agree with Parker (2005.98) that they were "minor magistrates" and that "their duties are confined to the performance of rites." Unlike Parker, I think their role should be clearly distinguished from that of priests.

100 A dedication by hieropoioi to Theseus after they had received a crown in 344/3 (*IG* II^2 2832) would indicate that hieropoioi were still involved in his cult at this time. A former hieropoios dedicated a herm in 350–330 (*Agora* 18.79). Of other dedications by hieropoioi, *SEG* 54.171 of 325/4 gives no indication of a religious context, and *IG* II^2 2859 from Piraeus in mid-III BC, dedicated to Artemis, is surely from a private cult.

terms, the hieropoioi are further evidence of the participation and expertise expected of Athenian citizens.

Epimeletai

Like the hieropoioi, the boards of epimeletai probably consisted of ten men, chosen by election or sortition to one-year terms. They seem to have somewhat different roles from the hieropoioi. The hieropoioi "for the year," for example, served several cults and *heortai*, whereas it appears that each board of epimeletai was concerned with one cult. There are separate boards of epimeletai for Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira and for Asclepius in Piraeus.[101] Also, we have hieropoioi for quadrennial *heortai*—the *theoria* to Delos, the Brauronia, Herakleia, Eleusinia, and Hephaisteia—, but epimeletai for annual *heortai*—the Mysteries, City Dionysia, and Amphiaraia.[102] There seems to be no overlap, with both hieropoioi and epimeletai serving one cult, with the exception, as always, of Eleusis.[103] Epimeletai with the archon supervised the City Dionysia and at one time were elected and both administered and paid for the *pompe*, but by the late fourth century they were selected by lot and were just administering the *pompe* and receiving necessary funds from the polis. They also sacrificed at this *heorte* and were responsible for the "good order." For the Amphiaraia the epimeletai supervised not only the *pompe* but also the *agones* and the "other things the Demos assigned them." Epimeletai supervised the *pompe* and joined the sacrifice, no doubt annual, to Zeus Soter and Athena and also "spread the couch" and "adorned the table." Epimeletai also sacrificed, annually, to Asclepius in Piraeus.[104] For the City Dionysia and Amphiaraia their duties were remarkably similar to those of the hieropoioi for the quadrennial *heortai*. The role of the epimeletai of the Mysteries was much more extensive than that of any other board of epimeletai, for an account of which see Appendix 7. Except for them, no other epimeletai are attested to have made financial contributions to the cults they served.

These boards of hieropoioi and epimeletai were selected by the Boule, but, perhaps, once selected had considerable independence, the decisions and impulses of any one member being controlled by the other nine members.

---

101 An exception here are the hieropoioi for the Semnai.

102 An exception here may be the hieropoioi "of the year" who may also have contributed to the annual Panathenaia.

103 There would be both hieropoioi and epimeletai for the cult of Amphiaraus only if we accept emendation of *Ath. Pol.* 54.7. See above, p. 73, note 99. If so, the epimeletai may have supervised the annual *heorte*, the hieropoioi a quadrennial one.

104 City Dionysia, *Ath. Pol.* 56.4 and *IG* II^3 1284.34–6; Amphiaraia, *IG* II^3 355.11–20; Zeus Soter, *Agora* 16.186.11–18 and *IG* II^2 676.10–15; and Asclepius, *IG* II^2 783.

We have no reports of them to the Boule or indication that their performance was formally evaluated, and there is only slight evidence that they were individually or as a group subject to financial audits at the end of their terms.[105] The use of such boards, serving one-year terms, often with a member from each tribe, is, of course, characteristic of Athenian democratic practices, especially in the financial area. Of particular importance here is that all hieropoioi and epimeletai allotted or elected by the Boule served only polis cults. Demes and private associations appointed their own hieropoioi and epimeletai for their cults.[106]

Athlothetai

The *Ath. Pol.* (60.1–3) describes a board of ten, one from each tribe, chosen by lot for a four-year term to supervise the *pompe* and *agones* of the (quadrennial) Panathenaia.[107] They were also to have the *peplos* and prize amphorae made (in collaboration with the Boule) and were to distribute the olive oil to the winning competitors. From Hekatombaion 4 until the Panathenaia (Hekatombaion 28 or a bit earlier) they dined in the Prytaneion (62.2). This board was still performing some of these duties in mid-III BC.[108] These appear to be the only board members subject to a *dokimasia* (*Ath. Pol.* 60.1). We have for these officials an unusually detailed description of one set of, probably minor, activities in *IG* II^3 298.24–44 of 347/3. The Athenians decided to give Spartocus and Paerisiades, joint kings of the Cimmerian Bosporus, various honors, including gold crowns at the quadrennial Panathenaia. The athlothetai are to have the crowns made, worth 1,000 drachmas each, in the year before the Panathenaia and are to proclaim, surely at the quadrennial Panathenaia,

105 The hieropoioi and priests of Dionysus and other gods of Piraeus in 340–330 reported τὰ ἀγαθά in their sacrifices and were expected to give *euthynai* (*IG* II^3 416), but they seem to be a special commission sorting out religious conditions in Piraeus at a difficult time just before or after Chaeronea, with, perhaps, responsibilities beyond those of usual hieropoioi. If the readings and restorations of the problematical *IG* II^3 369.45–6 are correct, they would have the hieropoioi "for the year" rendering *euthynai* in 325/4. The epimeletai of the Mysteries, exceptional in so many ways, in 214/3 gave both accounts (λόγοι) and rendered *euthynai* of their activities (*IG* II^3 1164.27–30).

106 The hieropoioi for the sanctuary of Hebe of the deme Aixone did render *euthynai* (*IG* II^2 1199.6–7 of 320/19). About the hieropoioi of the demes, Whitehead (1986.142) concludes:

"Nor is any very clear pattern to be seen in what they do, save in the most general of terms, and it would probably be ill-advised to attempt to impose one."

107 For the likelihood that, before the athlothetai were introduced (i.e., some time before 446/5), hieropoioi established and managed the *agones* of the quadrennial Panathenaia, see Shear, 2001.451–5, 514–5, and 544.

108 *IG* II^2 784.7–11.

that "the Demos of Athenians crowns Spartocus and Paerisiades, the children of Leucon, because of their ἀρετή and εὔνοια toward the Demos of Athenians." Since they are dedicating their crowns to Athena Polias, the athlothetai are to dedicate the crowns in the temple, after inscribing them "Spartocus and Paerisiades, children of Leucon, dedicated (them) when they were crowned by the Demos of Athenians." The tamias of the Demos is to give the money for the crowns to the athlothetai.[109]

The evidence for the hieropoioi, epimeletai, and athlothetai comes almost exclusively from the fifth and fourth centuries BC, and, though extremely sparse, shows some divisions of labor. The athlothetai are concerned with the *pompe, agones, peplos*, amphorae and other prizes of the quadrennial Panathenaia. The hieropoioi handle the Hephaisteia and the *pompe*, sacrifices, and *pannychis* of the annual Panathenaia, while epimeletai "supervise" the Mysteries, City Dionysia, and Amphiaraia.

Agonothetai

What happened to these various boards when a single, elected agonothetes replaced the various choregoi and seems to have assumed other *heorte* reponsibilities in late IV BC, during the reign of Demetrius of Phaleron?[110] The hieropoioi "of the year" seem to disappear. Athlothetai reappear once, in 239/8, doing much of what the *Ath. Pol.* (60.1–3) assigned them for the quadrennial Panathenaia nearly a century earlier.[111] The agonothetai are, alas, introduced later than the *Ath. Pol.*, and so we lack a convenient description of their duties, but we have partial compensation for this in extensive epigraphical texts, dated in the half century after the office was established, in particular for Philippides (*IG* II^2 657), Phaedrus (682), and Agathaeus (780). For two of these (Philippides and Phaedrus) the *agonothesia* was just one, and the final, element of a distinguished career including military and diplomatic service. Agathaeus was praised for his *agonothesia* alone. Phaedrus, agonothetes of 282/1, "supervised" the sacrifices and *agones*, but nothing is said of making sacrifices or of using his own funds. Philippides, agonothetes of 284/3, "sacrificed" the πάτριοι θυσίαι on behalf of the Demos and prepared a new *agon* for Demeter and Kore in remembrance of the freedom of the Demos. He "gave all the *agones* to the Athenians," "supervised" the other *agones* and sacrifices, and for all of these things spent

109 Spartocus' crown is then recorded in two inventories of treasures stored in the Hecatompedon: *IG* II^2 1485.21–4 and 1486.14–16, both of late IV BC.

110 On which, see above, p. 94 and Wilson, 2000.270–6.

111 *IG* II^2 784.7–11.

from his own funds. Agathaeus in 252/1 made sacrifices to Dionysus and the other gods to whom it was πάτριον to sacrifice and reported on the results of his sacrifices. He, too, sacrificed the πάτριοι θυσίαι, and also "supervised" the Dionysiac and other *agones*. There is no evidence that he spent his own money for any of this. He did, however, submit to *euthynai* of his financial accounts at the end of his term of office, and so may have all agonothetai. Noteworthy here is that apparently all *agones* were the responsibility of each of these men for a year, but when a *heorte* is named, it is only the City Dionysia.[112] The *agones* of the Panathenaia are absent in these texts, but they were still under the supervision of the athlothetai.[113]

The question is whether, at the beginning, agonothetai were just administering the *agones* and sacrifices or were also expected to pay for them, as in the previous centuries choregoi had for Dionysiac *agones*.[114] The cost to an individual would have been enormous, as we have seen,[115] and only Philippides is explicitly praised for using his own funds. He alone is explicitly said to have "given" the *agones* to the Athenians.[116] Even then he may have supplemented rather than replaced polis funds, and he may be the exception in this period. As late as ca. 215 we apparently still have one individual, the prominent politician Euryclides, serving as agonothetes. The exact amount he spent, a whopping 63,000 drachmas, is announced.[117] By mid-II BC the situation has apparently changed. We now have separate agonothetai for the Theseia and Panathenaia, and, if we use early I BC evidence, one agonothetes (Medeios) for the Panathenaia and Delia[118] and another in other years (Sarapion) for the Panathenaia, Delia, Eleusinia, and Diasia.[119] In this highly plutocratic period of the Athenian "democracy," all of these agonothetai are reported to have contributed their own funds. Miltiades, as agonothetes of the Panathenaia

112 It is noteworthy that both the honors for Agathaeus as agonothetes were decreed immediately after the City Dionysia (*IG* II^2 780).

113 Agathaeus, probably as agonothetes, contributed some effort to the Panathenaia and its games administered by the athlothetai ca. 239/8 (*IG* II^2 784.8).

114 On this question see Wilson, 2000.273 and 275.

115 Above, pp. 94–5.

116 *IG* II^2 657.42, ἔδωκεν, which is unparalleled in the context of an agonothetes' activity. Elsewhere the agonothetai "supervised" *agones: IG* II^2 682.54–9, 780.16–18, 957.4–5, and 958.6–7; or "made" them, *IG* II^2 780.15–16 and *SEG* 39.125.14–15.

117 *IG* II^3 1160. The first such surviving report of the amount an agonothetes spent is *SEG* 39.125.18–19 of 255/4.

118 Though not in the same year (Shear, 2001.233).

119 *SEG* 32.218.182–7 and 208–13.

ca. 140, spent vast sums of his own money to restore the *heorte*.[120] Others in the period no doubt spent less, but the specific amounts, as for Euryclides, are not reported.[121] The evidence is insufficient to allow positive conclusions, but a hypothesis the evidence suggests is that initially and for at least 60 years the individual agonothetai primarily administered the *agones* and supervised or performed some sacrifices. The costs were still borne by the polis, but an agonothetes, like Philippides, could contribute if he so wished. By mid-II BC the single *agonothesia* was divided up by *heortai*, with individuals responsible for and, perhaps, now paying significant amounts of the costs of their *heortai*, and part of honoring these agonothetai was declaring the exact amounts they spent. The conclusion would be that not all the early agonothetai contributed their own funds in the performance of their duties and that most probably did not pay the full costs of the *agones* under their supervision.[122] Euryclides and Miltiades, in this as in many other aspects of their careers, were probably the exceptions.

Administrative Officials

The Nine Archons

The nine archons, apparently together, sacrificed on behalf of their successors (Lysias 26.8). In the new plans for the sacrifices to Athena made in 335–300, the nine archons together were to receive portions.[123] In mid-IV BC they received portions of the meat of the main sacrificial animal in a *heorte* of Asclepius.[124] And in 128/7 the nine archons "led" the Pythaïs to Delphi, a role held in IV BC by hieropoioi.[125]

The (Eponymous) Archon[126]

The archon supervised the *pompai* of City Dionysia, Thargelia, Asclepieia, and for Zeus Soter. He appointed and controlled the various possible legal

120 *IG* II^2 968.41–52. On the financing of the Panathenaia in general, and on the role of the agonothetai in that, see Shear, 2001.496–504, and on Miltiades in particular, 499.

121 *IG* II^2 956, 957, and 958.

122 This serves to revise my conclusions on the financial role of agonothetai in 1998.57, 280, and 298–9.

123 *IG* II^3 447.36–7.

124 *IG* II^2 47.35–8.

125 *FD* 3.2.3 and 3.1.511.

126 On how the separate religious roles of the archon, the basileus, and the polemarch may have developed in the archaic period, see Davies, 1988.372–4.

proceedings for the choregoi of the City Dionysia, Thargelia, and Delia until the *choregia* was abolished at the end of IV BC (*Ath. Pol.* 56.3–5). In Demosthenes' time he allotted the flute players to the choregoi for the dithyrambs and also could be charged with wrongdoing in the meeting of the Ekklesia after the City Dionysia (21.8–9 and 13). For the Panathenaia he collected the olive oil for the prize amphorae (*Ath. Pol.* 60.2–3).[127] At the time of the *Ath. Pol.* the archon "administered" (διοικεῖ) the *agones* of the Dionysia and Thargelia (56.5), but the archons of 283/2 (Euthius) and of 282/1 (Nicias) are both praised for their supervision of the *pompe* of the City Dionysia,[128] and this makes it likely that in III BC and later the archon was responsible for only the *pompe* of this *heorte*. Now the agonothetai would handle the *agones*. Both Euthius and Nicias sacrificed to Dionysus, surely at the City Dionysia, Nicias "on behalf of the health and safety of the Boule, Demos of Athenians, and crops in the land," and on the good outcome of these he reported to the Boule. Nicias also made the "other sacrifices which were appropriate for him to sacrifice." What these "other sacrifices" were is not clear.[129] An archon at least once attended, along with the strategos and the epimeletai, the ephebes' sacrifice to Ajax on Salamis.[130] In the reorganization of Apollo's *heortai* in 129/8, he was ordered to sacrifice, along with the basileus and the strategoi, to Apollo.[131] The archon of 394/3 and his paredros and grammateus dedicated a herm.[132] As a more personal dedication, Plistaenus, an archon who had served in mid-II BC, his wife, and his daughter made a dedication to Dionysus, perhaps appropriate given the archon's role in the City Dionysia.[133]

The (*Archon*) *Basileus*

Of all Athenian governmental officials the basileus had the deepest roots in Athenian religion and is most linked to τὰ πάτρια and to the *nomoi* of Solon.[134] He administered (διοικεῖ) "so to speak, all the πάτριοι θυσίαι," and the one basileus who we know sacrificed, Philippides, in 293/2 is honored for having

127 On the procedure for this, and on the possibility that the task passed to other officials later, see Shear, 2001.405–9 and 465–6.

128 *Agora* 16.181.10–13 and *IG* II^2 668.13–15. Cf. the restorations of *IG* II^2 781 and *IG* II^3 1298.

129 These are probably referred to also in *Agora* 16.181.11–12.

130 *IG* II^2 1008.76–7.

131 *SEG* 21.469C.24–5.

132 *Agora* 18.35.

133 *IG* II^2 3479. On Plistaenus' date, see Tracy, 1990.141–2.

134 On the religious role of the basileus, see Rhodes, 1993.636–40, Carlier, 1984.329–42, and above, pp. 168–9.

sacrificed κα[τ]ὰ τὰ π[άτ]ρια.[135] And, unlike any other administrative or legislative official, he had a cultic role to play beyond sacrifice. He and his wife were central figures in the little-known ritual of, apparently, a sacred marriage and secret sacrifices at the Anthesteria, all κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, and for this role his wife had to have been a virgin when she married him.[136] He was also involved in the finance of the sanctuaries, recording the price, renters, and their guarantors of sacred lands and, perhaps, prosecuting defaulters.[137] It was he who was to mark out the boundaries of the sanctuaries in the Pelargikon and was perhaps responsible for settling all such disputes.[138] He did settle disputes involving *gene* and priesthoods.[139] Most importantly, he was the archon with whom charges of ἀσέβεια were lodged.[140] In addition to all of this, he administered the *pompe* and *agon* of the Lenaia and the performance of all *agones* consisting of torch-races.[141] And, after the reorganization of the Apollo cult in 129/8 he joined other administrators in sacrifices to Apollo.[142] Perhaps most indicative of his general supervision of sacrifices is that the inscriptions recording the late V BC revision and republishing of the State Calendar of sacrifices were erected in his office, the Stoa Basileios in the Agora.

The basileus had a major role in the Eleusinian Mysteries, supervising κατὰ τὰ πάτρια the whole together with the epimeletai and the Eumolpidae and Kerykes, reporting on the performance to the prytaneis, sacrificing and praying at both Eleusis and the Eleusinion in Athens, and bringing to justice those that misbehaved during the Mysteries.[143] And, finally, in ca. 175–135 the past basileus Euxenus and his paredroi made a dedication commemorating the crowns they were awarded by the Boule and Demos.[144]

It is remarkable, but characteristic of Athenian religion, that a citizen selected by lot for a one-year term could have such major and complex religious responsibilities, most of which required a thorough knowledge of religious traditions and contemporary practices.

---

135 *Ath. Pol.* 3.3 and 57.1 and *SEG* 45.101.25–27. Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 3.1285b16–17, Pl. *Pol.* 290e5–8, Pollux 8.90, and schol. to Pl. *Euthyph.* 2a. On αἱ πάτριοι θυσίαι see Chapter 6.

136 [Dem.] 59.73 and 85.

137 *IG* I^3 84.

138 *I. Eleusis* 28a.54–9.

139 *Ath. Pol.* 57.2.

140 Pl. *Euthyph.* 2a3–4, Hyperid. 4.6, and *Ath. Pol.* 57.2. See Harrison, 1971.8–9 and 37–9.

141 *Ath. Pol.* 57.1. On this in regards to the Panathenaia, see Shear, 2001.464.

142 *SEG* 21.469C.24–5.

143 For these activities, see Appendix 7.

144 *Agora* 18.39.

The Polemarch

Like the basileus the polemarch, in contrast to the archon, administered τὰ πάτρια.[145] This fact and that he sacrificed to Artemis Agrotera and Enyalios, arranged the "*agon* at the tomb" for the war-dead, and made the ἐναγίσματα for Harmodius and Aristogiton we owe to the *Ath. Pol.* (3.3 and 58.1). The offering to Artemis Agrotera and Enyalios is most likely that made annually to commemorate the victory at Marathon (Xen. *Ana.* 3.2.12 and Plut. *Mor.* 862c),[146] and the tomb offerings suit this official's title. It is noteworthy that the cult of Harmodius and Aristogiton, the tyrant slayers, is by association with the polemarch put in the context of war, and they are, to judge by the record, the only heroes to whom Athenian governmental officials sacrificed. There is no other evidence for the polemarch's religious activities.[147]

The Thesmothetai

The thesmothetai were expected, like some members of the Boule, to go on the Pythaïs to Delphi in IV BC (Dem. 29.128). Other than that, they are first attested to have performed religious services in the reorganization of the Apollo cult in 129/8, ordered to join the priest of Apollo, the basileus, and the herald of the Areopagus Council in a sacrifice.[148]

In terms of governmental involvement in the sacrificial activity of Athens, most striking is the general lack of participation by administrative officials. Apart from a very few areas of traditional responsibility, of the basileus in the Eleusinian cult, of the polemarch in sacrifices to Artemis Agrotera and Enyalios, both known from the classical period, there are at the most only a handful of attested sacrifices down to the Roman period, and most of these are recorded only in the idiosyncratic *SEG* 21.469C of 129/8.

---

145 On the religious activities of the polemarch, see Rhodes, 1993.650–2 and above, p. 219.

146 On which see above, p. 125.

147 A polemarch made a dedication, probably a statue of himself, ca. 150 (*Agora* 18.40). The sanctuary and the deity, if any, are unknown.

148 *SEG* 21.469C.51–2. The four surviving dedications by thesmothetai (*IG*^{2} 2836, 2837, 2843, and 2855), three from IV BC and one from III BC, give no indication that their crowns were awarded for religious services or to which deities, if any, the dedications were made.

Military Officials

The Strategoi

One must distinguish between strategoi of the usual, traditional sort and those that commanded garrisons of Athenian soldiers on Athenian territory, common in III BC. And here we treat the religious activities of the usual strategoi in, more or less, their governmental and civic capacity, not on military expeditions. Xenophon's *Anabasis* suggests that these activities on expeditions would have been extensive, almost daily: sacrifices and taking omens before battles.[149] Evidence of their religious activities at home is rare and scattered. They as a group made libations to Dionysus at the City Dionysia, made some sacrifices with the taxiarchs, and one sacrificed at least once with the ephebes at the Aianteia.[150] From the sacrifices to Athena at the annual Panathenaia the strategoi and taxiarchs together received portions (*IG* II^3 447.39–40). They were included in the new sacrifices to Apollo in the reorganization of his cult in 129/8.[151] In 446/5 they were ordered, by a *psephisma*, to supervise and provide the funds for sacrifices to be made "from the oracles concerning Euboia" by three members of the Boule. The strategoi were probably involved because the sacrifices were to be made on Euboea and quickly, and the funds they provided were undoubtedly polis funds and not their own (*IG* I^3 40.64–9). In the 330's they administered funds collected from the sale of skins of sacrificial victims of various polis *heortai* and sacrifices.[152] In III and II BC the strategos ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευήν was made a member of a committee managing the inventorying and repair of dedications for the sanctuary of the Heros Iatros and for that of Aphrodite.[153] Strategoi also probably played a role in marshalling the armed forces in *pompai* (Dem. 4.26).[154] These are all relatively minor roles.

By contrast the strategoi of garrisons in Athens were heavily and prominently involved in the religious activities of their troops and of the regions in which they were quartered. Various strategoi at Rhamnous, for example,

149 For which see Pritchett, 1971.109–15.

150 Dionysia, Plut. *Cim*. 8.7; taxiarchs, *Agora* 16.185.7–11 and 187.9–13; Aianteia, *IG* II^2 1008.76–7.

151 *SEG* 21.469C.24–7. An emendation of line 26 would have the strategoi alone also "putting on" the sacrifices and *pompai* of the Thargelia. That is unlikely. The subject of the clause has been omitted by the scribe, but should probably be the archon, with or without other officials.

152 *IG* II^2 1496. Parker (1996.221), mistakenly I believe, describes the strategoi as "in charge of" these sacrifices. Later (p. 249 n. 108) he more correctly states that "what level of involvement that implies is uncertain." See above, pp. 66–7.

153 *IG* II^2 840, II^3 1154, and *SEG* 34.95.

154 Shear, 2001.128–9.

contributed victims for the sacrifices of the Nemesia, sacrifices which had lapsed. They sacrificed to Themis, Nemesis, and Aphrodite Hegemone and to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira; held a torchrace; gave land for a sanctuary of Sarapis; and repaired the sanctuary of Nemesis.[155] Theomnestus, strategos at Sunium in 219/8, built a temple and sanctuary of Asclepius.[156] A strategos at Eleusis invited all citizens to sacrifices at the Haloa.[157] These garrisons obviously formed ad hoc religious as well as military communities,[158] and the very active religious role, both personal and financial, of the head of these communities differs from the usual roles of administrators and officials in the Athenian religious community; but these activities of the strategoi of garrisons suggest how all strategoi, and in fact military officials in general, might have had a role in polis religion if the Athenians had determined to give them one.

The strategoi of garrisons made dedications in their territories: in Rhamnous, one in mid-III BC for having been given crowns by the Boule and Demos, and several for a brief period at the end of II BC to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, sometimes adding Themis and Nemesis, to honor victors in athletic contests. Another, interestingly, made a dedication to Dionysus Lenaios.[159] In late II BC in Piraeus one strategos made a dedication to Aphrodite Euploia, another to Hermes Hegemonios.[160] These are all clearly dedications to deities in the locales in which the strategoi served. Although strategoi occasionally set up or were honored with monuments in the Agora, only one such dedication, by the hoplite strategos Xenocles of mid-II BC, has a divine recipient, the Heros Strategos.[161]

155 Contributing victims, *I. Rhamnous* II.17.27–30; sacrifices, *I. Rhamnous* II.31.17–18, 32.10–14, 22.1–3, and 26.6–8 (cf. *I. Rhamnous* II.23.1–3, 38.11–12, 49.20–1, and 50.22–3); torch race, *I. Rhamnous* II.22.3; land for Sarapis, *I. Rhamnous* II.59; and repairing sanctuary, *I. Rhamnous* II.3.15–16.

156 *IG* II^2 1302.

157 *I. Eleusis* 196.9–13 of ca. 234.

158 On which see above, pp. 67–8.

159 *I. Rhamnous* II.129, 148 of 117/6, 149 of 108/7, 150 of 101/0, 151 of the same period, 152 of 99/8; 136 of mid-III BC.

160 *IG* II^2 2872 of ca. 97/6 and 2873 of 95/4. Cf. *IG* II^2 2857 from Sunium and, perhaps, *I. Eleusis* 94 from Eleusis.

161 *Agora* 18.168. For other monuments, usually statue bases, for or by strategoi, see, e.g., *IG* II^2 2866 and *Agora* 18.148, 162, 169, and 170. On these and on the Heros Strategos, see *Agora* 18, p. 81.

The Taxiarchs

Taxiarchs, the commanders of the tribal units of infantry, in 275/4 and 271 sacrificed with the strategoi to unnamed deities, and at Rhamnous joined the strategos and hieropoioi in a sacrifice to Nemesis.[162] In 281/0 six taxiarchs were sent to Boeotia to sacrifice at the Basileia and reported on the results of their sacrifice.[163] After 335–330 they received, with the strategoi, portions from the sacrifices to Athena at the annual Panathenaia.[164] In 302/1 the taxiarchs were honored because they "supervised good order" in the sanctuaries of Demeter.[165] This may, or may not, be somehow connected with the dedication the ten taxiarchs made to Demeter and Kore at the City Eleusinion in the period 350–300 (*Agora* 18.152). The taxiarchs also marshalled the infantry of their tribes in *pompai* (Dem. 4.26 and Lysias 13.82).[166]

The Hipparchs

For the hipparchs, the two elected commanders of the cavalry, we have the usual scraps of information about their sacrifices: *eisiteteria* made to Poseidon (Hippios?) and other deities ca. 184/3, and fellow cavalrymen praising their hipparch in 187/6 for having sacrificed with them.[167] But in addition we have Xenophon's essay *Hipparchos*, precious in that it includes both private and public religious activities.[168] Xenophon lists as one duty of the hipparch "that he will 'seek good omens in sacrifices' (καλλιερήσει) to the gods on behalf of the cavalry" (*Hipp*. 3.1), and such a sacrifice might well be the *eisiteteria*. He also claims that the hipparch "must excel in serving the gods and in being skilled in war" (7.1),[169] and, perhaps as an example of that, Xenophon proposes as the hipparch's first duty on assuming office "to sacrifice and ask the gods to grant that he think, say, and do those things from which he would hold office in a way most pleasing to the gods and most dear, glorious, and beneficial to himself, his friends, and the city" (*Hipp*. 1.1). Xenophon stresses the cavalry's role in *pompai* and gives details of such displays in the Agora. The hipparch's role is to make them "worth seeing" (ἀξιοθεάτους), beautiful, and pleasing to gods and

162 *Agora* 16.185.7–11 and 187.9–13.

163 *Agora* 16.182.

164 *IG* II^3 447.39–40.

165 *Agora* 16.123.11–15.

166 Shear, 2001.128–9.

167 *Agora* 16.270 and *IG* II^3 1281.23–4.

168 I use the title *Hipparchos*, abbreviated as *Hipp*., as more precise than the usual *De Equitum Magistro*.

169 On the nature and broad implications of "service of the gods" (θεραπεία τῶν θεῶν), see Mikalson, 2010.29–42.

men (2.1, 3.1–5. Cf. Dem. 4.26).[170] Demosthenes snarkily notes that Meidias, when serving as hipparch, could not even ride a horse through the Agora in the *pompai*, but when he did "lead" the *pompai*, he had to borrow another's horse (21.171 and 174).[171]

There are also many Xenophantic invocations of the gods in the *Hipparchus*: to do something "with the god(s)" (1.1, 5.14, 7.14, 9.8), "with the gods as allies" (7.4), or to ask from them an ability to deceive the enemy (5.11). In opening the *Hipparchus* Xenophon recommended the prayer given above, following the usual principle of the priority of the divine.[172] In closing he similarly invokes the gods:

> If someone is surprised that many times it has been written 'to act with a god,' let him know well that if he is many times in danger, he will be less surprised at this. And, when war occurs, the opponents plot against one another, but seldom do they know how their plots are faring. Therefore in such matters one can find no one else with whom to consult except the gods. They know all things and indicate them to whomever they wish, in bird omens, omens, and dreams. And it is reasonable that the gods advise these who ask what they must do not only when they are in need but also in times of good fortune provide the gods whatever service they can (9.8–9).

Whether hipparchs in general shared Xenophon's outlook is impossible to determine, but Xenophon was a military man who knew what and for whom he was writing, and I suspect many hipparchs, phylarchs, strategoi, and taxiarchs shared these sentiments that Xenophon is urging on them. But the *Hipparchus* should serve as a salutary reminder of how little we really know about the religious actions and especially beliefs of all these (and other) officials solely from the epigraphical record.

Dedications by and honors of hipparchs and their subordinates, the phylarchs, show a strong affinity for the cult of Hermes, either expressly made to Hermes or to be erected in the Stoa of the Herms in the Agora.[173] This nicely

---

170 The cavalry displays Xenophon (*Hipp*. 3.1) lists, in the Academy, in the Lyceum, at Phaleron, and in the hippodrome, are apparently not parts of *heortai*.

171 Xenophon would not have been happy, either. Cf. *Hipp*. 6.4–5.

172 Mikalson, 1983.13–17.

173 Personal dedications by phylarchs to Hermes, *SEG* 36.269 from Daphne and 47.197 from the Academy survive. On the association of hipparchs with Hermes and on other dedications by hipparchs, see *Agora* 18, p. 82 and Bugh, 1988.219–20. The dedication by a

accords with Xenophon's encouragement to hipparchs to begin their displays in *pompai* at the Herms in the Agora (3.2). After IV BC such dedications by hipparchs and phylarchs were apparently replaced by honorary decrees, sometimes set up near the Stoa of the Herms.[174]

The Phylarchs

There are recorded sacrifices by only one phylarch, Theophilus, a commander of his tribal unit of the cavalry. He was honored by his fellow tribesmen of Antiochis in late III or early II BC because, among other things, he sacrificed all the sacrifices to the gods (*SEG* 46.148). Phylarchs also probably played a role in marshalling the cavalrymen of their tribes in *pompai* (Dem. 4.26). Honors of phylarchs, as we have just seen, are usually associated with Hermes, but when the Antiochis tribe honored their phylarch, they erected the *stele* in the sanctuary of Antiochos, their eponymous hero.[175]

If we leave aside the exceptional situations of the garrison strategoi and of the involvement of numerous officials in the reorganization of the cult of Apollo in 129/8, there are only scattered and rare attestations of sacrifices by military officers.[176] Their major contribution to the polis religious program seems to have been marshalling the troops under their command in *pompai* which required the presence of troops, as, e.g., that of the Panathenaia. But the individual *pompai*, as we have seen, were under the supervision of non-military officials. The variety of religious activities, including sacrifice, establishing sanctuaries, and donations by the strategoi of the garrisons, is exceptional, determined by the unusual conditions of their role and location.

The Ephebes[177]

No later than 127/6 a new class of ephebes marked their enrollment (ἐγγραφαί) with *eisiteteria*, sacrifices to Demos and the Charites in the Prytaneion, and

---

hipparch to Demeter and Kore near Eleusis (*I. Eleusis* 39) may have been the result of his success in a battle there (Clinton, 2005–2008.II.62).

174 *SEG* 21.525 and 46.167 record honors given to the same hipparchs and phylarchs in 282/1, the first by fellow cavalrymen, the second by a group of mercenaries. Both stelai are to be erected in the Stoa of the Herms, and a copy of the first, by the Athenian cavalrymen, also in the Poseidonion, probably the sanctuary of Poseidon Hippios. Cf. *SEG* 21.357.9.

175 *SEG* 3.115.22–3. Possible also in *SEG* 46.148.16.

176 Again, of course, excluding sacrifices on the battlefield.

177 On the many religious activities of the ephebes in the Hellenistic period and the deities and *heortai* involved, and for the relevant texts, see Deshours, 2011.155–77 and

they were joined in these by the priest of Demos and the Charites, the exegetai, and their kosmetes. They probably concluded their service by taking the Oath of the Ephebes in the sanctuary of Aglauros, and as witnesses to this oath they invoked Aglauros, Hestia, Enyo, Enyalios, Ares and Athena Areia, Zeus, Thallo, Auxo, Hegemone, Heracles, the territory of the fatherland, the wheat, barley, vines, olive-trees, and fig trees.[178] During their year of service they regularly sacrificed to Dionysus at the City Dionysia and in Piraeus at the Dionysia there. The ephebes also traveled to Salamis, every year it seems, to sacrifice at the Aianteia, and, most years, to Zeus Tropaios. Other ephebic sacrifices appear occasionally, recorded for only one or two years. They were to Amphiaraus at Oropus, Artemis Mounychia, Asclepius and Hermes on Salamis, Athena Nike, Athena Polias, Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, Megaloi Theoi, Mother of the Gods at the Galaxia, Semnai, "the gods holding Attica," and at the Chalkeia, Eleusinia, and the Mysteries.[179] And in 122/1 the ephebes sent and sacrificed a bull for the Dionysia.[180] The ephebes also provided "services" (λειτουργίαι) at various annual events. One such service was the "liftings of the cows" required at sacrifices, surely at the Mysteries and the Proerosia and at some other, unspecified sacrifices.[181] The ephebes performed another such service by participating in *pompai*, for Athena Nike, for the Eleusinian Mysteries, and quite likely for the Semnai.[182] In *SEG* 22.110. 53–4 it is said of the ephebes of 79/8 that they joined in *all* the *pompai* for the polis. In 176/5 the ephebes are attested to have garlanded the tomb at Marathon and to have held a "tomb-contest" there.[183] The ephebes also regularly participated in races which were *agones* of some *heortai*.[184]

In terms of authority, their kosmetes supervised the sacrifices and other religious activities of the ephebes and is regularly honored in the ephebic decrees for having done so. Twice, in 127/6 and 106/5, the kosmetes of the ephebes made a report of sacrifices he made with the ephebes.[185] He may, in fact, have made the various sacrifices as the ephebes observed. For a brief period at the end of the second century kosmetai contributed for sacrifices involving

---

Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007. My understanding of some of these activities and especially of the financing of them differs from theirs.

178 This oath is preserved in R&O #88 of mid-IV BC.

179 For the many references here, see Chapter 3.

180 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.13.

181 *IG* II^3 1256.9 and 14–15 of 196/5 and 1313.9–10 of 176/5 and 90–1 of 175/4.

182 *IG* II^3 1256.8–9 and 1176.9–10.

183 *IG* II^3 1313.15–17.

184 *IG* II^3 1256.10–11, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.11 and 22, and *IG* II^2 1011.9–10.

185 *SEG* 15.104.84–5 and 107–10 and *IG* II^2 1011.33–5 and 39–40.

the ephebes.[186] Both Eudoxus in 107/6 and Timon in 102/1 "from their own funds" paid for the *eisiteteria*.[187] Demetrius, the kosmetes of 117/6, paid for *all* the sacrifices to the gods and benefactors of the Demos.[188] The kosmetai, apparently, were the only ephebic officials to contribute money to the ephebes' religious program, and only for a few years. Many of these ephebic religious activities were governed by *nomoi* and *psephismata*. In 213/2 the ephebes are praised for sacrificing to the gods, "following ([ἀκολούθως]) the *nomoi* and the *psephismata*.[189] These sacrifices included the *eisiteteria* and those at the ἐγγραφαί.[190] In 127/6 all their races in the various *agones*, their torch-races, and *pompai* may have been dictated by *nomoi* and *psephismata*. In the same text their display in weapons at the Theseia and elsewhere was also dictated by *nomoi* and *psephismata*.[191] Their regular dedication of a *phiale* to the Mother of the Gods was controlled by a *psephisma*.[192] The ephebeia in the form we have it in II BC was a relatively recent foundation, and it is not surprising that τὰ πάτρια are so rarely invoked in their activities. The ephebes of 204/3 made the *pompai* of the Semnai and of Iakchos "following τὰ πάτρια,"[193] and in 106/5 they and their kosmetes sacrificed to Dionysus and to the other gods to whom it was πάτριον.[194] Certainly the latter and perhaps the former refer more to the cult's πάτρια than to any πάτρια of the ephebes' own activities. The real authority for the ephebes' religious program is the *nomoi* and *psephismata*, i.e., the Ekklesia.

The rich sacrificial program of the ephebes compares to that only of the prytaneis, but it is likely that their purposes were quite different. The prytaneis clearly provided polis representation at the *heortai* at which they sacrificed. We should perhaps view the sacrifices by the ephebes rather as part of the educational program of the ephebes. Just as they were learning the geography of their country, the workings of the Ekklesia, and the skills necessary to be soldiers, so, as an essential part of their civic education, they were, through

186 See Chapter 5.

187 Eudoxus, *IG* II^2 1011.34–5; Timon, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.95–9.

188 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.10–11, 60–1.

189 For evidence, see Chapter 7.

190 Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.6–8 of 122/1. Cf. *SEG* 15.104.5–8 of 127/6.

191 *SEG* 15.104.12–15 and 17–18.

192 *SEG* 15.104.27–8. Cf. Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.23–4, 79–80, *IG* II^2 1029.24–5, and 1030.35–6.

193 *IG* II^3 1176.9–10. ἀκολουθῶς with τὰ πάτρια is found only here in inscriptions and literary texts.

194 *IG* II^2 1011.66–7 and 76.

their involvement in sacrifices, *pompai*, and other rituals, learning the religious heritage of their homeland.

If we leave aside the ephebes and the prytaneis, we come to the conclusion that participation in sacrificial activity by government officials, whether administrative officers, legislative groups, military officers, or alloted and elected lay officials was minimal in both the number of sacrifices and in the number of cults, both of which are a small fraction of the thousands of major and minor sacrifices and cults in Athens and Attica at the time. The conclusion, which must be drawn *ex silentio*, is that priests and priestesses must throughout this period, and probably earlier in the classical period, have been performing the overwhelming majority of the sacrifices, with little or no polis involvement or interference.

By Comparison to What?

The role of Athenian legislative and administrative structures in religious matters appears to be slight, but in comparison to what? We offer three cases for comparison, one legislative, one of an administrative official, and one of a military official, each of which varies from the usual Athenian practice: the role of the polis in the cult of Demeter at Eleusis, the role of the demarchs in their demes, and the role of the strategoi of garrisons.

Cult of Demeter at Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries

The collection of evidence in Appendix 7 reveals what has been obvious in bits and pieces throughout this study, that the polis, the Demos of Athenians, was heavily involved with the cult of Demeter and the Mysteries at Eleusis at all levels. The rituals were no doubt under the control of the Eumolpidae and Kerykes and the priestesses they selected. But most other aspects, from general management and final scrutiny of the Mysteries, the meeting of the Boule in Eleusis, to the announcement, amount, and collection of the *aparche*, to the election of hieropoioi and epimeletai, to building in the sanctuary, to punishment for religious violations, and to financial accounts down to the obol were under the control, in one way or another, of numerous *nomoi* and *psephismata*, the Boule, prytaneis, and especially the basileus from the earliest (Solonian) to the latest times of our study. Polis involvement and control in this cult are exceptional in both extent and degree, but they give us an idea of what tight polis control of other cults would have looked like—and what the evidence would look like—if in fact it existed. There is nothing comparable, even for the major polis *heortai* of the City Dionysia and the Panathenaia.

Demarchs

The inscriptions from the demes are a small fraction of those from the polis and from a much more restricted time period ending in early II BC,[195] but we have far more sacrifices performed by the demarchs than by any polis administrative official in the whole epigraphical and literary record. The demarch of the deme Marathon, for example, made seven each year, that of Eleusis made at least five. The demarch of Erchia made at least one and perhaps many more.[196] The demarchs of Skambonidai, Eleusis, Hagnous, Ikarion, and Rhamnous all sacrificed, some several times a year. The demarch of Rhamnous, with his tamias, was ordered to supervise the new, annual sacrifice to Antigonus Gonatas. Unlike any polis administrative officials, two demarchs, both of Eleusis, contributed money for their own sacrifices. The demarchs of Ikarion, Acharnai, Piraeus, and Eleusis supervised or "made" their local Dionysia with all their components. The demarch of Piraeus enforced regulations of the Thesmophorion there. All the demarchs were, according to a *psephisma*, to collect taxes from the cavalrymen (two drachmas) and hoplites (one drachma) of their deme each year for the support of a sanctuary of Apollo.[197] The real, extensive, and continuous interaction of governmental administrative officers in sacrificial and other religious activity occurs at the deme level, not at the polis level, but these activities suggest what archons and other administrative officials would have been doing—and, again, what the evidence would look like—if the Athenians had assigned them extensive religious, especially sacrificial, roles.

Strategoi

We have just surveyed the personal and financial religious roles of the strategoi of troops garrisoned in Attica, and they involved sacrifices, *heortai*, and the building of sanctuaries. None of this is to be found for the more usual strategoi of the classical and Hellenistic periods, but these activities of the strategoi of garrisons suggest how all strategoi, and in fact military officials in general, might have had a role in polis religion if the Athenians had determined to give them one.

---

195 *Agora* 16.277 of ca. 180 is the last surviving deme decree.

196 Also noteworthy is how many of the sacrifices by demarchs are to heroes and heroines, in contrast to those by polis officials. This probably reflects the very local character of many heroes and heroines.

197 *IG* I^3 138 of, probably, before 434.

Some Observations on the Authority of the Polis

We offer here some observations based on the bulk of the evidence presented so far. One will find exceptions in the same evidence to some of these generalizations (as is always the case in studies of Greek religion), but we trust that some generalizations will be useful in assessing the range and degree of polis control of Athenian cults.

At the outset we reassert that the polis, through the Ekklesia, had the authority and power to do whatever it wished concerning religion and religious practices in Attica. It was constrained by τὰ πάτρια, previous *nomoi* and *psephismata*, and oracles, but it could by a vote of the majority decide to act in opposition to any one of these. A quite separate matter, but one critically important for the shape and practice of religion by Athenians, is what the Ekklesia did do, and likewise what the Boule, prytanies, its committees, and administrative and military officials did in fact do in contrast to what they might have done, and that is what the inscriptions and to a lesser extent the literary sources tell us.

Except for the Ekklesia's authority to authorize new cults and the basileus' authority to mark and perhaps regulate sanctuary boundaries, all attested activity by units and officials of the polis in their official capacities concerned only polis cults and polis *heortai*. If we look back to the ten types of cults distinguished in the Introduction (polis, tribal, deme, phratry, gentilic, oikos, private cults of citizens only, of foreigners only, or of foreigners and citizens together, and cults established by individuals), there is polis involvement attested only for the first, polis cults. We do not find *nomoi* and *psephismata* controlling the others or the polis providing financing for them. Administrative and military officials are not involved with them in an official capacity. In cases such as that of the cult of Bendis which moved from being a private cult to a polis cult, the *polis* acted in granting permission for the cult initially but became involved in the cult itself only after it became a polis cult. So, in terms of all non-polis cults, even if the Ekklesia or other polis agencies had the authority to control or regulate, they apparently did not.

Even within the range of polis cults we find the polis legislative, administrative, and military units involved in relatively few. There appears to have been regular, annual polis oversight and financing only for the cults of Athena Polias and Nike, Dionysus Eleuthereus, Asclepius, Apollo Patroös and Pythios, Demeter at Eleusis, Artemis Agrotera and Enyalios, Harmodius and Aristogiton, Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira in both city and Piraeus,

Amphiaraus, Bendis, Theseus, and for the Thargelia and Hephaisteia.[198] These are, of course, cults and *heortai* of central importance to the religion of Athens, but they are only a part of what one normally thinks of as Athenian polis cults and rituals. Not included, as examples, are the Aiora, Anakeia, Apatouria, Arrephoria, Boedromia, Bouphonia, Delphinia, Diasia, Dorpeia, Epidauria, Gamelia, Genesia, Hekatombaia, Hermaia, Kalligeneia, Kronia, Kybernesia, Metageitnia, Metoikia, Mounichia, Niketeria, Olympieia, Oschophoria, Pandia, Plerosia, Pompaia, Posidea, Procharisteria, Proerosia, Prometheia, Pyanopsia, Skira, Stenia, Synoikia, and Theogamia.[199]

The two lists differ in good part because the former, those in which the polis is formally involved, include *pompai* and/or *agones*, whereas the latter are mostly simply rituals of various types. In fact, the majority of polis interventions in polis cults concern their *agones* and *pompai*, not their sacrifices or other rituals. In various ways and somewhat differently at different periods, archons, tamiai, epimeletai, hieropoioi, athlothetai, choregoi, and agonothetai alloted or elected by the Ekklesia and Boule "supervised," organized, and managed the financing of these *agones* and *pompai*, events which were spectacles for a large public audience. There is no evidence that they, or the polis itself, controlled or regulated the prayers, hymns, dances, and the rituals of sacrifice or that they made the major sacrifices.

The *nomoi* and *psephismata* listed in Chapter 7 and the discussions of the roles of various officials also indicate quite clearly that the main participation of the polis in those cults with which it was involved, through its legislative units, their committees, and the various officials, was financial. For some it paid for the perquisites of the priests or priestesses and for sacrificial victims and then, for a time after 334/3, recovered the costs of the skins from some of these sacrifices. For some *heortai* it financed the *pompai* and *agones*. For a few the polis as a whole was concerned with the value and protection of dedications and paid the costs of repairing or remodeling them. It approved of the design of and paid for temples of polis cults. For these cults, listed above, it was primarily concerned with managing costs and revenues, not with, we might say, the performance of ritual.

In terms of the financing of construction in sanctuaries and of certain other religious activities, we have a remarkable contrast between what Athenians as individuals were contributing for cults on Delos and what they apparently

198 We do not include here cults and *heortai* at which, as examples, the prytaneis or the ephebes sacrificed annually in the course of their term. On such sacrifices, see below.

199 This list is from Parker, 2005.456–84 and Mikalson, 1975. On the possible disappearance of some of these during the Hellenistic period, see Parker, 1996.270–1.

were not contributing at home, all in the same period. In 168/7 the Romans gave Athens Delos as a free port. The Athenians expelled the Delians and took over the island, including all the cults, some old and venerable, some quite new. The Athenians reorganized the priesthoods, made them annual, and divided them among themselves.[200] If we look at the next 80 years, until Mithridates sacked Delos in 88/7, we can compare contributions by individual Athenians in Athens and on Delos. For Athens we have record of contributions only by various agonothetai, kosmetai of the ephebes, by participants in the Pythaïdes,[201] and by subscribers to a repair of the Theater of Dionysus in Piraeus (See Chapter 5). On Delos, by contrast, we have, apart from almost countless statue dedications, the following: gifts by individual Athenians including a cult statue, altars, an exedra, and various buildings for the sanctuary of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia; a temple and other buildings for the Megaloi Theoi; an arch and doorway for Pan; for Sarapis a megaron, exedrai, vaults, altars, and steps, a spring house, a temple, and a gateway and pavement; and for Aphrodite Hagne vaults, a throne, pilasters, altars, and temples. There is, simply put, nothing like this going on in Athens. In Athens there were some repairs to sanctuaries, on Delos major construction of new temples, altars, and other buildings in several sanctuaries. Some Athenians obviously had fortunes large enough to bear these major expenditures, but they chose to adorn Delos and its cults, not Athenian cults.[202] We can only guess at possible reasons: the novelty of the new cults, the available space for new buildings, the lack of centralized polis control, the desire to impress an international audience, and so forth. But, for our purposes, the salient point is that in Athens the surviving inscriptions indicate (*ex silentio*) that apparently there was no such major private financial support of polis cults.

Most importantly, though, the Athenian polis through the individual cults' revenues or through its own revenues paid, I would argue, for virtually all of the *sacrifices* made on behalf of the polis throughout the Hellenistic period. A review of the evidence in Chapter 5 indicates that neither priests, nor government officials, nor private individuals paid for them, with rare exceptions in time of crisis. The same evidence indicates that, at various times and in various ways, individuals as elected or alloted officials sometimes paid all or some of the costs of the *agones* and *pompai* of some polis *heortai*, but not for the sacrifices, which, with their accompanying prayers, would be the central religious

200 On all of this and on the following and for references, see Mikalson, 1998.216–41.

201 And even many of these were priests of cults on Delos.

202 The ultra-rich Medeios was an exception, contributing to both Delian and Athenian cults. See Chapter 5 and Mikalson, 1998.239–41 and 279.

moment. And it here must be noted that the polis did not pay for sacrifices or other events of *genos*, deme, or private cults.[203]

The major change in financing, from the classical to the Hellenistic period, is widely recognized and well studied. In the classical period choregoi financed individual choruses in a number of Dionysiac *heortai* at considerable expense, and the change from the about fifty choregoi to one elected agonothetes during the reign of Demetrius of Phaleron (317/6–308/7) resulted in a distinctive feature of the finances of religious activities in the whole Hellenistic period. In the early times of the *agonothesia* the polis may have paid the costs and the agonothetes only "put on" the *agones*, but it is clear that from 283/2 at the latest and until at least the mid-second century and probably considerably later, the *agones*, the dramatic, dithyrambic, musical, and athletic contests, of some major religious *heortai*, including those of the Panathenaia and City Dionysia, could be financed at least in part by a rich and prominent Athenian as agonothetes each year.[204] Other *heortai* in which agonothetai were possibly involved include the Lenaia, Thargelia, Dionysia in Piraeus and on Salamis, Eleusinia, and Delia.[205] But were the agonothetai contributing, when they did contribute, only for the *agones*, as their name would imply, or were they also paying for sacrificial victims, the *pompai*, and other expenses of these *heortai*?

---

203 Parker (2005.62) claims that "the fragments surviving to us of Solon's State Calendar of sacrifices reveal three or four instances of local sacrifices paid for by the city; there were doubtless many more." Of the evidence he offers, frag. 82 (Ruschenbusch) just mentions a sacrifice to Leos at Hagnous, and Callimachus, frag. 103 [Pf.] similarly just claims that the *kyrbeis* "sing of" the "Hero at the Stern." No payment is mentioned in either. The *genos* of Salaminioi does twice receive "polis funds," once for the statewide Oschophoria and Deipnophoria which they manage (R&O 37.20–22) and once for sacrificial victims for their sacrifices to Ion and perhaps others (87–8). The authority for the last is Solon's *kyrbeis*. In the former certainly and perhaps in the latter, the polis is giving funds to the Salaminioi to perform their role in a polis-wide cult. The priestess of the cult of Artemis in Oinoe, who receives a sacrifice in Nicomachus' calendar (*SEG* 52.48. frag. 12.4–6), is of sufficient polis importance that she had a reserved seat in the theater of Dionysus (see Lambert, 2002.384). Parker does not define what he means by "local sacrifices," and I belabor all of this because I do not think that these should be taken as counter-examples to my claim that the Athenians as a polis did not offer financial support to *gene*, deme, and private cults, the only sure exception being when, as above, a *genos* is performing its duties for the polis ritual.

204 On all aspects of the Athenian *choregia*, see Wilson, 2000. On the *agonothesia* and the results of the change from *choregiai* to *agonothesiai, ibid*. 270–6. For the possibility that the first agonothetai, as Xenocles in 307/6 (*IG* II^2 3073), just "managed" the *agones* which the state paid for, *ibid*. 273.

205 Wilson, 2000.382 n. 46.

One did, for one *heorte*. Miltiades shortly after 143 clearly solved a financial crisis of the Panathenaia, and not only put on the *agones* but also loaned the polis money, made repairs on the Acropolis, gave needed gear for the transport of the *peplos*, and took control of the *pompe* and sacrifices, paying for it all, apparently, himself.[206] But this was an exceptional situation in an exceptional time, and we should perhaps assume that usually agonothetai simply "made the *agones*," but even that alone could involve enormous expense. Apart from the contributions of the agonothetai to the *agones* and except for Miltiades, we can assume, I think, that for the *heortai* the polis paid for the sacrifices and, after late IV BC, for the *pompai* of all but the Theseia.[207]

The large and various programs of private giving for religious purposes initiated and promoted by Lycurgus after 336, a time in which he as a polis financial official solicited loans and funds and in-kind contributions from citizens and resident foreigners for religious purposes and buildings, were unique and were not sustained after his death. The sporadic giving after this time, except for the agonothetai, indicate that Lycurgus' program did not become a model for the future, in part, perhaps, because of Athens' change of leadership and reduced economic circumstances. The evidence collected and especially the "Summary of Contributions" in Chapter 5 allow some conclusions that put private contributions to polis cults into perspective. There were a few, sporadic contributions by individuals for polis religious matters. The Mysteries and other Eleusinian cults were the major beneficiaries of private contributions by their epimeletai, demarchs, and one private individual. Strategoi of garrisoned troops, from 269/8 to late III BC, made generous contributions to cults in locales under their authority. Relatively brief fashions brought contributions from the agonothetai of the Theseia (161/0–153/2) and the kosmetai of the ephebes (117/6 and 102/1). These private contributions are few, sporadic, and mostly, it appears, one-time events. They do not reveal any serious, sustained, or organized effort by polis officials, priests and priestesses, or other religious officials. The infrequent and usually small financial contributions by priests and other officials and individuals

206 *IG* II^2 968.41–55. Philippides in 284/3 "*gave* to all Athenians all their *agones*" and may have also paid for the sacrificial victims of the *heortai*, although the general reference in line 47 is not decisive for this (*IG* II^2 657.38–47). That agonothetai regularly sacrificed at *heortai* in which they were involved does not mean that they paid for the victims they sacrificed.

207 The agonothetai of the Theseia in mid- to late II BC, in addition to financing the *agones*, also supervised the *pompe*, and one gave cash to the prytaneis for a sacrifice and to the bouleutai for a paid holiday. Two of them are remembered specifically for "giving readily" (ἑτοιμῶς διδόντων). See *IG* II^2 956, 957, and 958.

that we have uncovered suggest strongly that, as in the classical period, throughout the Hellenistic period the polis bore virtually all the expenses of its religious program apart from the *agones* of some major *heortai*.

The evidence from Chapter 5 would also suggest that neither the number of private contributions nor their amounts increased from the end of the Lycurgan period to the beginning of the Roman period. We have roughly the same number of contributions from III and II BC, and from III BC a good percentage are from strategoi of garrisoned soldiers, a special case, and from II BC a similar percentage are from agonothetai of the Theseia, an apparently new office. No one sacred or civil official apart from the agonothetai seems to have consistently, not to say increasingly, made donations throughout the Hellenistic period.

At nearly the end of our period, 103/2–97/6, we see quite a new and, in fact, unique situation, probably occasioned by Athens' increasingly desperate economic situation and the inability of the polis to finance a large new or revived religious activity, the Pythaïs, the *theoria* to be sent from Athens to Delphi. *SEG* 32.218 lists contributors to these Pythaïdes. They include, among various others, officials we have seen before: on the administrative side, the nine archons; on the military side, various strategoi; and on the religious side, Athenian priests of numerous cults on Delos.[208] They were all contributing, as the result of a *psephisma, ex officio* because, while the individuals holding these offices changed from year to year, the titles remained constant on the donor list. Most officials of all types gave 100–250 drachmas each year. Noteworthy here is that the priests were contributing not to their own cults but to meet the costs of the Pythaïs.[209] This situation and this document are unique in Athens' Hellenistic history, and we must take care not to conclude from it that such contributions by these priests, archons, strategoi, and private individuals were customary or indicative of practices of the whole period.

I offer all of this to counter the larger, common view that in the course of the Hellenistic period rich people assumed more and more of the costs of polis cult, specifically that there was a "collapse of conventional, collective, means of religious funding," that "provision of sacrificial victims depended mainly on the generosity of those wealthy individuals who were also the city's office-holders."[210] If we eliminate special cases, such as the strategoi of garrisoned

208 For the complete list of contributors, see Tracy, 1982.100–104. The technitai of Dionysus had contributed "not a little money" for their participation in the Pythaïs of 138/7 (*FD* 3.2.47.30–1).

209 Other such subscriptions are rare and are of a much smaller scale. See Chapter 5.

210 Lambert, 2012.83 and 85. Cf. Parker 1996.269.

troops and the officials of the Eleusinian cult and Eleusis, and if we concentrate on polis-wide cults, there is no evidence for regular, continuous, or significant financial contributions to sacrifices by individuals. We have such contributions for sacrifices, one time each, only by the priestess of Athena Polias in 255/4 and by the tamias of a prytany in 256/5. The special role of the agonothetai is decribed above. Some of them also at their own expense sacrificed—not necessarily the major sacrifices—in the Dionysia or Theseia of their years, but they should not be taken as the model for the usual situation in other polis cults.

My interpretation of the evidence is that throughout the Hellenistic period the polis continued to bear, for those cults that did not have their own incomes, the vast majority of the expenses of the polis sacrifices and *heortai*, and also for the construction and maintenance of sanctuary properties, as it had done in the classical period.[211] In the classical period choregoi were paying the costs of *agones* of the Dionysiac *heortai*. In the Hellenistic period the agonothetai may have chosen, or not chosen, to contribute to these and, in addition, to those of some athletic *agones*. Apart from that, I find no evidence that after the age of Lycurgus polis support was limited or decreased, that wealthy individuals were now bearing the costs of polis cult. The polis cult was still the cult practised and largely paid for by the Demos.

By way of contrast we may look at the financing of sacrificial programs in the demes and private religious associations (*koina*). A comparison between the State Calendar and those of the Marathonian Tetrapolis and of the deme Erchia is illuminating: the polis pays for its sacrifices but the demes, or at least these five demes, have individuals pay for them.[212] On the State Calendar there is no indication of the source of the revenues. It must have been the polis. On the back of the Marathonian calendar are listed individuals and amounts of money (20–100) which they contributed, probably to create an endowment for the sacrificial program.[213] The Erchia calendar is divided in such a way as to create five sections of sacrifices that each add up to an equal amount, ca. 110 drachmas, in all probability with each section to be paid for by one individual each year. In short, in these demes individuals were financing the sacrificial program. For polis cults there is no such indication, and the polis must have paid the costs.

---

211 Not directly relevant but analogous with my claim are Habicht's (1995) conclusions about the roles of the elites and non-elites in democratic states in the classical and Hellenistic periods.

212 Calendar of polis, *SEG* 52.48; of Marathonian Tetrapolis, *SEG* 50.168; of Erchia, *SEG* 21.541.

213 On this see Lambert, 2000a.66–7.

Also regarding demes, there is no record of the polis contributing to nor of polis officials participating in deme sacrifices,[214] but we do have a few occurrences of demesmen going to Athens to make sacrifices in V and IV BC. One category of expenses for the demesmen of Plotheia was for sacrificial animals "for Athenians on behalf of the *koinon* of Plotheians."[215] And demesmen of Erchia on Metageitnion 12 went to Athens and sacrificed to Apollo Lykeios, to Demeter at Eleusis, and to Zeus Polieus and Athena Polias on the Acropolis. In Anthesterion they also provided a sheep for the Diasia at Agrai.[216] These are all not simply contributions of a deme to polis events, but annual sacrifices by demesmen on their own behalf at polis sanctuaries.[217]

Private religious associations (*koina*), whether of citizens or foreigners, naturally depended heavily on their members for financial support. Their tamiai, epimeletai, and hieropoioi regularly contributed sums for sacrifices and repair or construction of their sanctuaries.[218] The number of texts recording the activities of the *koina* is very small compared to those of the polis, and so the numerous accounts of the contributions of their members are all the more revealing. They suggest what the evidence might look like if polis officials had regularly contributed their own funds to polis religious activities.

Some officials such as archons, hieropoioi, and agonothetai and also the ephebes made sacrifices "at" various events (Chapter 3), and a few reported to the Boule on the success of these sacrifices (Chapter 4). How are we to imagine the relationship of these to the activities of the priests and priestesses of

214 Mikalson, 1977.

215 *IG* I^3 258.25–31. On which see Whitehead, 1986.165–9 and Mikalson, 1977.427–8. If we take ἱερά . . . ἐς [ʼA]θηναίος of lines 30–1 to be the same as τὰ ἱερὰ . . . τὰ ἐς ʼAθηναίος of lines 25–6 (as is usually not done), we have, before this deme decree, partipating demesmen paying individually the costs of only the ἱερά at Athens "on behalf of the *koinon* of Plotheians," and if we take the quadrennial *heortai* of lines 27–8 as deme *heortai*, we avoid the unparalleled situation of a deme or individual demesmen paying to participate in polis sacrifices and *heortai* and speculation (as in Parker, 2005.73–4) as to how this worked and the festivals involved.

216 *SEG* 21.541.A1–5, B1–5, Γ13–18, and E13–17, and, for Diasia, A37–43, of 375–350 (?). The contribution to the Diasia is explained by the unusual nature of the Diasia, for which see Parker, 2005.73–4.

217 *IG* I^3 244.13–21 is not (*pace* Shear, 2001.95–7 and 168–9) sufficient evidence that the Skambonidae made their own sacrifice at the Panathenaia. It concerns, probably, only the place of distribution of their share of the polis sacrifices. The *genos* of the Salaminioi did sacrifice a pig at the Panathenaia (R&O #37.88–9), but one can only speculate as to the context and purpose, as in Shear, 2001.168–9.

218 See Chapter 4.

these deities? It seems reasonable to assume, given the nature of Greek religion, that the default position, unless there is evidence to the contrary, is that the priest or priestess "made" the sacrifice,[219] and also that for the major *heortai* there were a number of sacrifices by a number of individuals. If these two assumptions are correct, that would mean that when we have records of, e.g., the archon, agonothetai, Boule, epimeletai, and ephebes each sacrificing at the City Dionysia, these need not be, in fact almost certainly were not, the central, major sacrifice(s) of the *heortai*.[220] We might term these sacrifices "accessory" to the main sacrifice.[221] Such accessory sacrifices by the officials "supervising" the *heortai* and *agones* of cults are logical. Those by the prytaneis suggest a desire by the polis to be represented, not to control or dominate the event. Those by the ephebes may have been intended in part as their introduction to the religious activities of their country, particularly those cults which had a nationalistic flavor. The causes may differ, and we can only guess at them. But it is highly probable that these various sacrifices accompanied, but did not make, the main event. We do not have good evidence for this because, for example, that the priest of Dionysus made the major sacrifice of the City Dionysia did not need to be stated for an Athenian audience. That would have been known and assumed by all. What did deserve mention was when someone else also sacrificed in the *heorte*. I would also conclude from previous discussions that the priest was sacrificing victims paid for by the *polis*, a fact also obvious and taken for granted.[222]

In connection with the above I would propose, although it cannot be proven, that an important organizing principle for polis religious activities was that the priests or priestesses "made" the core sacrifices and prayers in the events of their cults. Given the lack of evidence to the contrary and given general probability, we may assume this and assume as well that the priests and priestesses supervised, controlled, and "performed" most or all the ritual elements of

219 Parker's (2010.193–201) discussion of the new text from the deme Aixone (*SEG* 54.214), with its ten priesthoods and numerous sacrifices, brings to the foreground the number and sacrificial role of the many (Parker "recklessly" guesses at 545) deme priests and priestesses and helps to reestablish priests' and priestesses' central role in public sacrifice.

220 A possible exception may be the sacrifices by the hieropoioi at the Panathenaia, *IG* II^3 447.

221 To justify the notion of "accessory" sacrifices, I offer προθύματα (on which see Mikalson, 1972) and ἐπιτελεώματα (as described in Lycurgus, frag. 6.2 [Conomis]), without suggesting that any of the sacrifices here described were so named.

222 On this see, above, Chapter 2. For this in the context of deme sacrifices, see Parker, 2010.200 and Whitehead, 1986.202.

sacrifice, prayer, and other elements.[223] What it meant for a priest or priestess "to make a sacrifice" no doubt varied a bit from cult to cult. They need not have performed the whole ritual as described, e.g., by Homer. In some cases they may have just placed the offerings on the altar. This role of the priests and priestesses would have been so obvious to Athenians that it need not be stated. And this role of the priests and priestesses seems not to have been supervised by the polis. Priests of polis cults who handled money were, at least in IV BC, subject to the same financial audits as other public officials, but we do not have cases where priests or priestesses are brought to court for violations of their duties.[224] A few, such as the priest of Asclepius regularly and others occasionally, reported to the Boule on the good omens they received in sacrifices they made, but there is no evidence that they were expected to

223 In this regard, Lambert (2012.82) sees a change of role between priests and secular officials: "in the classical period priests are praised for the performance of their religious duties and other officials for the performance of the core duties of their office: councilors, for example, for their contributions to debate in the Council, superintendents of the water-supply for their contributions to the quality of the water-supply. In the Hellenistic period other officials are praised mainly for their performance of the same religious functions as priests are praised for."

Lambert offers as his one example *IG* II^2 780 (his text #29), praise of the agonothetes Agathaeus (below, pp. 242–3). He does not make explicit the duties of the priests he includes, nor which "other officials" he means. If we limit ourselves to sacrifices and to the "officials" treated in this book, Lambert's "change" seems chimerical. The agonothetai really do not come into play because they did not exist in the classical period. But, in any case, *IG* II^2 780 of 252/1 is exceptional in that it does foreground the sacrifices by the agonothetes, as Lambert claims, but other texts praising agonothetai give either roughly equal attention to sacrifices vs. other agonothetic activities or far less attention to them (roughly equal, *IG* II^2 657 and 682; less, *IG* II^2 956, 957, 958, 968, and *SEG* 40.121).

Lambert (82) concludes, without further evidence, that "The same could be said of the decrees honouring most Hellenistic officials—sacrifices are emphasised, the 'secular' substance of their functions retires into the background." For a somewhat different statement of this, see Gschnitzer, 1989.37: "dass in dem Augenblick, in dem eigentliche Magistrate in diese Rolle eintreten, sie die Priester und sakralen Functionäre in eine untergeordnete Stellung, zu blossen Gehilfen herabdrücken." I do not find that to be the case in the texts ascribing sacrifices to the officials discussed. I do not see the priests' religious role diminished or the secular officials' enlarged, nor that some sacrificial activity by secular officials, if their sacrifices were accessory as I propose, needed to impinge on that of the priests and priestesses.

224 An interesting exception here is the hierophant Archias who was tried in court on charges of ἀσέβεια for sacrificing παρὰ τὰ πάτρια, for making sacrifices the priestess should have made, and for having done it on the wrong day ([Dem.] 59.116). Here, as so very often, the cult was that of Demeter at Eleusis in which the polis was unusually engaged.

report or were examined on the proper performance of their duties. From V BC a few were elected and served one-year terms, but most were selected by *gene* for life-terms and would have been even less subject to polis-wide political influences.

Such authority as the Ekklesia and Boule chose to exercise they often did through lay committees whose members, often ten in number, were elected or allotted for one-year terms by the Ekklesia and Boule. The roles of the different committees, of hieropoioi, epimeletai, episkeuastai, athlothetai, and others varied over time and have been described above. These responsibilities seem mostly administrative in nature: supervising or "putting on" *pompai* and *agones*, receiving and disbursing polis funds for these events and for some sacrifices, overseeing the handling of dedications, the building of temples, and similar matters. There is no evidence that once in service these committees were under close supervision by the Boule or Ekklesia. Only the athlothetai are attested to have had to pass the *dokimasia* before their term began. They seem not to have rendered financial audits, either as individuals or as a board, at the end of their terms.[225] Perhaps it was thought that the committee structure itself, with members watching over one another, was sufficient to prevent fraud. Likewise there is no evidence that the committees or their individual members were held to account for their handling of non-financial matters in the religious sphere, but they were probably subject to accusations in the "review" meetings of the Boule that followed, for example, the City Dionysia and the Mysteries. They are many times praised by the polis, as a group but by name, for their good services, but we know of no instances where they were punished for misbehavior. It would appear that once appointed these committees were relatively autonomous, but they would be, of course, guided in their actions by the *nomoi, psephismata*, and τὰ πάτρια. It is testament to the Athenians' own knowledge of their polis cults that laymen could each year take up anew and complete so many adminstrative duties in the religious program of the polis. It is also, however, a sign of how fragmented authority was,

225 In terms of financial audits (εὐθυναί) at the end of terms, these board members may have been, in Athenian terminology, ἀνυπεύθυνοι, with a distinction, displeasing to Aeschines, between elected officials and volunteers taking on ἐπιμέλειαι and other such activities, often κατὰ ψηφίματα (Aeschin. 3.13–24). By contrast the activities of those charged with remaking or repairing dedications were monitored carefully, with a λόγος expected and sometimes engraved on stone (e.g., *IG* II^3 1154 and II^2 840). So, too, agonothetai, with so much individual authority and control over money, gave accountings of their use of public monies (*IG*^{2} 657.47–9, 780.20–1, 956.20–2, 958.16–18, and *SEG* 39.125.21–2). Wilson (2000.383–4 n. 50) thinks these particular audits "may have been little more than an occasion on which the demos devised the form of honours to be bestowed on their benefactor."

even at this level, in these matters: it was divided among a large number of citizens, and it changed hands completely from year to year. Of course, the very existence of this committee system indicates the desire to fragment, not to unify authority in all these matters.

In terms of the larger structure of polis control of religious activities, we need to begin with τὰ πάτρια and the *nomoi* of Solon. The *nomoi* of Solon probably codified some of the πάτρια already existing at Solon's time. Some were probably provisions for new or recent practices, practices which for later generations who respected them as Solon's *nomoi* became part of their πάτρια. Some of these *nomoi* treated the whole of polis cult, cult by cult, as, for example, the State Calendar which listed the days of sacrifice, the cost of the victims, and the cost of the perquisites for officials. Others seem to have offered prescriptions which covered religious behavior in general, as, for example, that τὰ ἱερά be the first items on the agenda of the Ekklesia, the limitations on participation at the *perirrhanteria* of the Agora, and pollution.

Others concerned specific cults, especially that of Demeter at Eleusis. None, so far as we know, claims authority over non-polis cults.

The *nomoi* and *psephismata* of later centuries were adopted in relation to Solon's *nomoi*, consciously modifying, expanding, or limiting them, or they were responses to new situations, but always in the framework of Solon's *nomoi*. They are all cult-specific and do not embrace under one *nomos* all cults, practices, or religious officials. Each has the appearance of an ad hoc response to a current situation and solves it through the legislative and administrative structure of its time. The resulting hodge-podge of *nomoi* and *psephismata* was not regularized until the recodification of the *nomoi*, including *nomoi* and *psephismata* on religious matters, by Nicomachus and his fellow commissioners in late V BC. We do not know when some distinctive features of the Athenian religious system were introduced: that, for example, the basileus handled αἱ πάτριοι θυσίαι and the archon τὰ ἐπίθετα, although the archon's role in the City Dionysia and the history of that *heorte* suggests that this division was early, perhaps Solonian, at least by mid-VI BC The committee structure of control of the *pompai* and *agones* looks very democratic, perhaps dating to late VI BC. The priestly control of sacrifices, prayers, and other rituals as I have posited it would be very old, surely predating even Solon, as would have been the gentilic ownership of the priesthoods.

The Athenian system of managing its polis cults obviously worked, and we may ask whether that is a result of a carefully designed system or one resulting from ad hoc responses as needs arose. There are four obvious cases of thoughtful management: the codification of the religious calendar and *nomoi* by Solon;

the recodification of the religious (and other) *nomoi* at the end of the fifth century; the creation, probably very early on in the democracy, of the lay committees; and the institution of the choregic system and then its replacement by the *agonothesia* during the time of Demetrius of Phaleron. The lay committees and probably also the choregic system brought some very democratically oriented control over major *heortai* which had probably been dominated by aristocratic groups before. The introduction of the *agonothesia* went in the opposite direction, with one individual assuming authority over, at least, the *agones* of some major *heortai*. Apart from these, most of the rest of what we see in legislative actions are ad hoc responses to new cults, especially their financing, or, more frequently, modifications and elaborations of what at least later Athenians considered to be the laws of Solon. Finally, such major cases of "thoughtful management," apart from Solon's *nomoi*, concerned primarily finances and *agones*, and none occurred after the end of the fourth century.

What we have, then, is a system first organized under Solon, then modified and expanded by various ad hoc decisions, and first reorganized about 180 years later, not to be systematically reorganized again. Authority was highly fragmented, with priests and their *gene* controlling the rituals of most polis cults, and with the Ekklesia, Boule, and various administrative and lay officials involved in a variety of ways in the financing and in the spectator events of a few major *heortai*. It worked, apparently, but it was hardly a coherent system that controlled closely the activities of its officials, priests and priestesses, and devotees. My conclusions here lead back to the conclusions of Robert Garland with which this chapter began, that "Religious authority in archaic and classical Athens was not in fact the preserve of any single social or political class, caste, or milieu. Its essence was complex and it had many sources and outlets," and "religious authority . . . was the monopoly neither of the citizen body as a whole nor of any particular group of individuals within it. It was a discrete prerogative shared out among a number of corporations comprising amateurs as well as experts, clergy as well as laity."[226]

226 Garland, 1984.75 and 120.

CHAPTER 12

Approbation

We offer this commendation of the agonothetes Agathaeus, son of Autocles, of the deme Prospalta,[1] *IG* II^2 780.6–20 from 252/1, the fullest such commendation we have, as a way to begin to summarize, through a translation, some of the results of our inquiry.[2]

> Concerning what the agonothetes reports about the sacrifices which he sacrificed to Dionysus and the other gods to whom it was an ancestral (custom to sacrifice), with good fortune, it has been resolved by the Demos, to accept the good things (i.e., favorable omens) that occurred in the sacrificial victims which he was sacrificing for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos of Athenians and their children and wives and King Antigonus. . . . Since the agonothetes, making proper respect towards the gods of the highest importance and showing the goodwill and love of honor which he has towards the Demos of Athenians, sacrificed all the ancestral sacrifices at the appropriate times beautifully and with proper respect, and he completed the *proagones* in the sanctuaries according to the ancestral customs, and he oversaw both the Dionysiac *agones* and the other *agones* beautifully and in a manner showing a love of honor, to praise the agonothetes Agathaeus, son of Autocles, of the deme of

1 This Agathaeus served as an agonothetes in the archonship of Callimedes (252/1) and again the next year in that of Thersilochus (251/0) (*IG* II^2 780). Earlier in the century he was honored for his role as phylarch (*SEG* 21.357.26) and later, in the archonship of Athenodorus (239/8), for assisting (συντελοῦντος) the athlothetai with the *agones* of the Panathenaia (*IG* II^2 784.8).

2 περὶ ὧν ἀ[παγγέλλ]ει ὁ ἀγωνοθέτης ὑπὲρ τῶν θυσιῶν ἃς ἔθυσεν τῶι τε Διονύσωι κ[αὶ τοῖς ἄλ]λοις θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον ἦν, ἀγαθῆι τύχηι δεδόχθαι τῶι δήμω[ι, τὰ μὲνἀ]γαθὰ δέχεσθαι τὰ γεγονότα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς οἷς ἔθυεν ἐφ᾽ ὑγιε[ίαι καὶ σω]τηρίαι τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων καὶ παίδων κα[ὶ γυναικῶ]ν [καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιγόνου. . . .]· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ ἀγωνοθέτης περὶ πλείστου ποιούμεν[ος τὴν πρ]ὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ ἀποδεικνύμενος [τ]ὴν εὔνοιαν [καὶ φιλοτι]μίαν ἣν ἔχει πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων τάς τε θυσίας πά[σας ἔθυσέ τ]ὰς πάτριους ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσιν χρόνοις καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶ[ς, ἐπετέλεσε]ν δὲ καὶ τοὺς προάγωνας τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, [ἐπεμελήθη] δ᾽ καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων τῶν τε Διονυσιακῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων καλῶς [καὶ φιλοτίμ]ως, ἐπαινέσαι τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην Ἀγαθαῖον Αὐτοκλέους [Προσπάλτιον [ε]ὐσεβείας ἕνεκα τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς [εἰς τὴν βουλ]ὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων. (*IG* II^2 780.6–20).

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_015

> Prospalta because of his proper respect towards the gods and his love of honor towards the Boule and Demos of Athenians.

Agathaeus as agonothetes had sacrificed the ancestral sacrifices to Dionysus and the gods traditionally associated with him, at the proper times, surely at the City Dionysia, and he had done so "beautifully and in a manner showing proper respect." These sacrifices were for, as was no doubt made explicit in the prayer accompanying the sacrifices, the "health and safety" of the Boule, Demos, their children and wives (always in this order), and of King Antigonus and his wife. Agathaeus then reported to the Boule that the omens were good in the sacrificial victims which he sacrificed. The Boule and then the Ekklesia passed a resolution accepting his report and praising him for his εὐσέβεια towards the gods and his φιλοτιμία towards the Demos of Athenians. He also had seen to the performance of the *proagones*, the "pre-*agones*," not all of them but those which were held "in the sanctuaries," and he had overseen various *agones*, his specific task as agonothetes. For all of this, in summary, he is again praised for his εὐσέβεια toward the gods and his φιλοτιμία towards the Boule and Demos of Athenians.

In brief summary, εὐσέβεια, directed to the gods, is included in Agathaeus' praises because he had himself performed sacrifices, not because of his administrative activities. His φιλοτιμία is directed to his fellow citizens, and, depending on context, may refer to sacrificial activity, administrative activity, or both. My rendering of καλῶς as "beautifully" in the phrases καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς and καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως is, if correct, one aspect, or really two—of sacrifice and of *agones*—of an esthetic of Athenian popular religion, of a pervasive desire that the major elements of religion, sacrifices, sacrificial victims, ritual, dedications, sanctuaries and their buildings, *pompai*, and, especially for the agonothetes Agathaeus, *agones* should be things of beauty.[3] And, finally, for the religious activities concerning certain deities and certain *heortai*, as here for Dionysus and the City Dionysia, τὰ πάτρια, "the ancestral (customs)," are the authority that is invoked, whereas for others, if authorities are given, we may expect *nomoi, psephismata*, or oracles.

After he has given his accounting, Agathaeus as his reward is to receive from the Demos "whatever good he seems worthy of" (εὑρέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δήμου ἀγαθ[ὸν ὅτου ἂν δοκ]εῖ ἄξιος εἶναι), and the decree is to be inscribed on a *stele* and erected in the *temenos* of Dionysus (21–5), on the south slope of the Acropolis, where this inscription was found. In these decrees the "good" of which the honorand is worthy is usually more specific. The honors given in

3 See Chapter 13.

Athens to those who performed religious activities were crowns, common in every honorary decree,[4] and, as here, praise. This praise expressed in the document, sometimes announced at a *heorte*, and published on the *stele*. For a brief period, the second half of IV BC, the polis rewarded a few who performed their duties well, especially religious duties, with funds "for a sacrifice" or "for a sacrifice and a dedication."[5] Neither the recipient of the sacrifice nor the nature of the dedication is specified. The deity is probably the deity served by the respective individuals and in whose sanctuary the *stele* is to be placed. The cost of the sacrifices, sometimes as much as 100 drachmas for a board, suggests a significant event. The occasion may have been the erection of the *stele* or dedication and would have provided a nice banquet for the honorands and their families. All of this is probably true of similar, but usually smaller "thank-you" sacrifices awarded by demes, tribes, the Mesogeoi, and the orgeones of Amynos, Asclepius, and Dexion.[6] Lambert has observed that "unlike Athenians, foreigners were never awarded money for a dedication and sacrifice."[7] In a cultic context that makes perfect sense. A foreigner would not be expected, or, better, would be expected not to make a sacrifice or dedication to an Athenian deity. In any case, this fashion of awarding funds to an honorand for a "thank-you" sacrifice was relatively brief.

But religious actions alone did not receive the greatest honors, αἱ μέγισται τίμαι, that Athens had to offer: *sitesis* in the Pyrtaneion, a bronze statue, and

4 Hakkarainen, 1997.26: "After the year 332/1 there is no honorary decree without crowning." See also Lambert, 2012a.8, 95, and 100, and Henry, 1983.23. On crowns and their types and cost, awarded by the demes, see Whitehead, 1986.162–3.

5 Sacrifices: 50 DR for Boule for best supervising εὐκοσμία in the theater (*IG* II^3 306.25–6 of 343/2); 30 DR for priest of Asclepius (*IG* II^3 359.23–6 of 328/7); and probably 5 DR each for ten hieropoioi of sanctuary of Dionysus in Piraeus (*IG* II^3 416.35–7 of 340-330). Sacrifice *and* dedication: 100 DR for ten epimeletai of Amphiaraia at Oropus (*IG* II^3 355.35–9 of 329/8) and 100 DR for eleven *archontes* (*SEG* 50.143.17–19 of 303/2). On this last text and the possible role of the *archontes* honored, see Lambert, 2000.492–5. On such sacrifices in general, see Lambert, 2012.74 and 2012a.54–5 and Rosivach, 1994.46.

6 Demes: Halai Araphrenides, 5 DR for *choregia* and other services (*SEG* 34.103.12–14 of period 335–315); Eleusis, 100 DR for choregic activity by a Theban (*I. Eleusis* 70.35–6 of mid-IV BC); Aixone, 10 DR twice for two choregoi each time (Schwenk #66.13–18 of 326/5 and *SEG* 36.186.9–11 of 313/2). Tribes: Pandionis, twice 50 DR for unspecified service (*Agora* 16.80.7–11 of period 332/1–324/3 and *IG* II^2 1152.7–9 of late IV BC); Aegis, amount lost, for its bouleutai (*Agora* 15.69.14–16 of 284/3, the last securely dated example). Mesogeoi, 15 DR for officials of cult of Heracles (*IG* II^2 1247.31 of mid-III BC). Orgeones, "whatever seems right," for two individuals of the cult (*IG* II^2 1252.12–14 after mid-IV BC).

7 Lambert, 2012a.95, but note *I. Eleusis* 70.35–6 by Eleusinians to a Theban residing in Eleusis.

proedria.[8] An individual who had performed a commendable religious action might receive one or all of these, but only if he had also done several other things, usually things involving military victory, the security of the country, or the grain supply.[9] Clearly religious actions ranked below, or differently from, these.

The polis or group intended more in these decrees than just giving honors for past religious services. Occasionally a clause of "hortatory intention," to encourage others to behave in the same way, is added onto honors for religious activities as it is for those who have performed other services.[10] For our purposes we treat only those texts that praise solely religious actions—not secular actions or religious and secular together, and we include honorary decrees of demes, *gene*, and private associations. There are two categories of these clauses in our texts: 1) those stating that the group is or wishes to appear expressing gratitude or knows how to do so—an implied hortatory intention; and 2) those explicitly encouraging others to perform in the same way as the honorand, sometimes in the explicit context of competition. These expressions are not quite so formulaic as other phrases, and we have for Category 1: in honors for an agonothetes, "so that the Boule and Demos may appear remembering those who show honor towards them and who give readily;"[11] for a benefactor to cult of Athena Polias, "so that the Boule and Demos may appear 'watching carefully' the favors for its benefactors;"[12] and for a hierophant, by the demesmen of Eleusis, "so that also the others may know that the Demos of the Eleusinians knows how to return favors to those who treat it well."[13] For explicit exhortations we have, in honors for a choregos, by the

---

8 On the μέγισται τίμαι, see Lambert, 2011.206; Luraghi, 2010.252–4; Hakkarainen, 1997.26–8; Gauthier, 1985.24–8 and 79–112; and Osborne, 1981.

9 E.g., *IG* II^2 657 and 682, *SEG* 28.60 and 45.101; and *Agora* 16.185 and 187. Private cults are more generous awarding statues and paintings of the honorand: e.g., *IG* II^2 1271, 1314, 1327, 1330, 1334. Demes awarded *proedria* for their own events: *IG* II^2 1214 and *SEG* 34.103 and 43.26.

10 Henry (1996) has a full study of the language, types, and chronology of such clauses of hortatory intention. See also Lambert, 2011 and Luraghi, 2010.250–2.

11 ὅπως οὖν καὶ ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος μνημονεύοντες φαίνωνται τῶν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς φιλοτιμουμένων καὶ ἑτοίμως διδόντων (*IG* II^2 956.22–4 of 161/0).

12 ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνηται διαφυλάττων [τοῖς εὐεργέταις] τὰς χάριτας (*IG* II^2 667.7–8, after 277).

13 (ὅπ[ως ἂν εἰδῶσ]ιν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ὅτι [ὁ δ]ῆ[μος ὁ Ἐλε]υσ[ι]νίων ἐπίστα[ται χ]ά[ριτας ἀπ]οδιδόναι τοῖς εὖ π[ο]ιο[ῦσιν αὐτὸ]ν (*I. Eleusis* 72.12–16 of mid-IV BC).

For similar statements, with variations: for bouleutai and others contributing to a dedication, by the Boule, *I. Oropos* 299.52–5 of 328/7; for a hierophant, by Kerykes and

deme, "so that those who are going to be choregoi for the Aixoneis may know that the Demos of Aixoneis will honor those who show honor to them;"[14] and, with the emphasis on competition, for the epimeletai of the Mysteries, by the polis, "so that it may be a matter of competition for those showing honor, when they know that they will receive favors worthy of the benefactions they provide."[15]

The expected return for services, when described, is χάριτες or χάριτες ἄξιαι, interestingly the same return one hoped for from the gods in return for serving them.[16]

The emphasis in all of these hortatory texts, with one exception, is on φιλοτιμία, with no mention of the εὐσέβεια that most of the individuals displayed. Perhaps the thought was that the social or political group would reward the one, the gods the other. The one exception is revealing. The priestess of Athena Polias had served well, φιλο[τιμουμέ]νη περὶ [τὴν θε]όν, an odd use of φιλοτιμούμενος directed to the gods, and the hortatory intention is expressed as "so that the Demos may appear honoring those who make *eusebeia* towards the gods of most importance,"[17] also a unique content in a hortatory intention. Here, as we saw before for this priestess, the φιλοτιμία towards fellow citizens may have been credited to her husband, the εὐσέβεια to her.[18]

Eumolpidae, *IG* II^2 1235.9–11 of ca. 274/3; for theoroi, by the state, *IG* II^3 1372.11–13 of before 180; for the priest of Kalliste, by the state, *IG* II^2 788.15–18 of 235/4; and for a priest of Asclepius, by the polis, *IG* II^3 1386.2–4 of ca. 170.

14 ὅπως ἂν εἰδῶσιν οἱ ἀεὶ μέλλοντες χορηγεῖν Αἰξωνεῦσι ὅτι τιμήσει αὐτοὺς ὁ δῆμος ὁ Αἰξωνέων τοὺς εἰς ἑαυτοὺς φιλοτιμου[μ]ένους (Schwenk #66.22–8 of 326/5). Cf. *SEG* 36.186.7–9 of 313/2, also from Aixone.

15 ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐφάμιλλον εἶ τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοι[ς] εἰδόσιν ὅτι χάριτας ἀξίας κομιοῦνται[ι ὧν] ἂν εὐεργετήσωσιν (*IG* II^3 1164.33–6 of 214/3).

This clause is used also concerning an agonothetes, *SEG* 39.125.22–5, for which see Hakkarainen, 1997.22; the hierophant, *I. Eleusis* 234.1–3; a trierarch who performed religious services, *I. Rhamnous* II.31.19–21. And several times concerning officials of private cults: tamias, grammateus, and epimeletes of the Sarapiastae, *IG* II^2 1292.17–19; epimeletes of Asclepiastae, 1293.8–11; the epimeletria of *thiasos* of Agathe Thea, *SEG* 56.203.15–17; an archeranistes, *IG* II^2 1297.6–9; the epimeletes of orgeones of Bendis, 1324.19–23; and the tamias and grammateus of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods, 1327.20–3 and 1329.19–22. None dates before mid-III BC, and the phrase is unattested in literary sources. On this see Hakkarainen, 1997.

16 See Chapter 1.

17 ὅπως ἂ[ν οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμος] φαίνηται τιμ[ῶν] τοὺς περὶ πλε[ίστου ποιουμένο]υς τὴν εἰς το[ὺς] θεοὺς εὐσέβ[ειαν] (*IG* II^2 776.20–2 of 237/6).

18 See Chapter 1, note 131.

The officials whose honors are meant to inspire others include a benefactor to the Panathenaia, priests and priestess, deme choregoi, an agonothetes, a hierophant, epimeletai of the Mysteries, bouleutai, and theoroi. Of these only the bouleutai, *choregoi*, agonothetes, benefactor, epimeletai of the Mysteries, and the priestess of Athena Polias clearly contributed money as part of their services. If we look at the whole of the texts praising them, raising money was not the only or, apparently, the most important purpose of the hortatory clauses.

The small private religious associations were particularly dependent on the financial and other contributions of their members,[19] and it is not surprising that, proportionately, they used the hortatory intention clause far more commonly. The citizen orgeones of Bendis in early II BC even employed, uniquely, both types of the clause in one text praising an epimelete: ὅπως ἂν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες φαίνωνται χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδόντες τοῖς ἀεὶ φιλοτιμουμένοις and ἵνα καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τῶν ὀργεώνων ἅπασιν ἐφάμιλλον εἶ τοῖς βουλομένοις πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβεῖν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας φιλοτιμεῖσθαι (*IG* II^2 1324.10–12 and 19–23). The language of other texts from private *koina* is very similar to those of the polis, as is the emphasis.[20] The εὐσεβεῖν of the text above is unique, and the others concentrate on φιλοτιμία, sometimes directed just to the members or the *koinon* as a whole,[21] sometimes to the deity as well as to the association.[22] Two of the latter cases are in honor of priestesses (*IG* II^2 1314 and 1337), much like the use of φιλοτιμία in the polis decree for the priestess of Athena Polias (*IG* II^2 776). As in the polis honors, some but not all of these private associations had clearly received financial support from the honorands.[23]

One sees, from mid-IV BC, individuals (priests, hieropoioi, and such) and groups (e.g., the prytaneis and ephebes) increasingly honored for their performance of sacrificial and other religious roles. Priests had always performed sacrifices, prytaneis probably since Solon had made sacrifices before meetings of the Ekklesia, but only now are they specifically honored for those, often in association with other activities. This change reflects a new fashion

19 See Chapter 5.

20 Orgeones of Amynos, Asclepius, and Dexion, *IG* II^2 1252.19–22; of Bendis, 1284.7–11, 1324.10–12, 19–25; of Syrian Aphrodite, 1337.9–11; *koinon* of Mother of the Gods, 1273.18–21, 1314.9–12, and 1315.16–18; thiasotai of Aphrodite, 1261.53–5; of Tynaros, 1262.12–15; of Zeus Labraundos, 1271.18–21; of Artemis, 1297.6–9; and *koina* of unidentified deities, 1259.7–9, 1277.29–33, and 1278.5–8; and Sarapiastae, 1292.17–19.

21 *IG* II^2 1252, 1259, 1262, 1273, 1284, and 1292.

22 *IG* II^2 1277, 1314, 1315, and 1337. But note also 1297 and 1324.

23 *IG* II^2 1271, 1277, and 1324.

of public honors, but it may also reveal a new attitude towards such activities, viewing them somewhat less as a corporate activity of the whole polis and somewhat more as an activity of individuals, of individuals who took pride more in themselves and their families and less, in the Periclean model, in the polis as a whole. But, regardless of who received credit for doing the sacrifices, for administering the *heortai*, or for, in some cases, making financial contributions, these same activities are directed to the same deities, the same *heortai*, and, perhaps, for much the same purposes as they had been in the archaic and classical periods. That is, τὰ πάτρια were respected and maintained. And some sacrifices and prayers, at least, were "for the benefit of the Boule and Demos," that is, explicitly intended to benefit the corporate group, and it was the corporate group, the polis, which through its decrees honored these activities of individuals. What is new is the attention, or at least public honor, given to the individuals and groups performing these acts, not the acts themselves or their purposes.

CHAPTER 13

Social and Esthetic Dimensions of Religious Actions

The Social Dimension

Individuals are frequently praised for performing certain religious actions, and especially sacrifices, εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, and further consideration of this phrase will, I think, bring to light both social as well as religious dimensions of these actions. When the phrase is expanded, as it often is, it becomes apparent that the εὐσέβεια is directed to the gods and, importantly, that the φιλοτιμία is directed to one's fellow citizens. That emerges clearly in the praise of Agathaeus: "making εὐσέβεια towards the gods of the highest importance and showing the goodwill and φιλοτιμία which he has towards the Demos of Athenians" and "because of his εὐσέβεια towards the gods and his φιλοτιμία towards the Boule and Demos of Athenians" (*IG* II^2 780.11–13, 19–20).[1]

From these formulae and many similar in many texts we may claim that our documents show, more clearly than other sources, the pervasive presence of *two* dimensions of religious actions, one for the audience of the gods, one for the audience of fellow citizens.[2] The gods, i.e., εὐσέβεια, almost always come

1 It is worth noting here that a purpose of sacrifice, for example, is ἵνα ἂν ἔχῃ καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, never ἵνα ἂν ἔχῃ φιλοτίμως τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς.

2 When an individual or group has performed a variety of secular and religious activities and is praised, in summation, εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας (as in, e.g., *IG* II^2 668, 677, 1163, 1320, *I. Eleusis* 181, *Agora* 15.78, 115, *IG* II^3 1155, 1165, and 1166), one need not, perhaps should not, assume that the εὐσέβεια refers to the religious activities, the φιλοτιμία strictly to the secular ones. φιλοτιμία is commonly invoked for purely religious acts, commonly in the phrases καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως (as especially in prytany decrees, e.g., *Agora* 15.115.12–13 and 17–19, *IG* II^3 1304.13–15, and *Agora* 15.240.15–16, but also in *IG* II^2 788.10–12, Lambert, 2012.99–100, #6.20–22, *Agora* 16.186.11–15, and *IG* II^3 1329.8–11) and εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας (e.g., *IG* II^2 676, 690, 780, 788, 1166, *I. Eleusis* 93, *IG* II^3 1139, 1164, *Agora* 15.78, 85, *SEG* 18.19, R&O #46, and *I. Rhamnous* II.59).

The separate "social dimension" of these honors has been noticed before, but scholars such as Lambert (2012.76 and 2011.201–2) tend to put the emphasis on the awarding of the honors, that is that the honors have both a religious and social dimension. I think, rather, that the context in many cases is the act itself, that one, for example, as in Agathaeus' case, *sacrificed* εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας, that the ἕνεκα clause describes the intent of the agent. If I

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_016

first, in accord with the usual priority of the gods in Greek life, but the second, which we may call the social dimension, is regularly there. εὐσέβεια, we have determined, is used only in certain contexts directly involving the gods, such as sacrifice and sanctuaries, but for other religious activities, such as staging a *pompe* or serving as a hieropoios, φιλοτιμία is also very, very common, usually in the phrase καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως.[3] Here, too, we should think of the φιλοτιμία as directed to the human audience. In all of these the agent was clearly wishing to win not only the approval of the gods but also the approval of his human audience. In the context of sacrifice, that τὰ ἱερά are καλά indicates the approval of the former, and our honorary inscriptions themselves express the approval of the latter.

The primary element of this social dimension is φιλοτιμία, that "love of honor" we have seen so many times and have discussed previously. To review briefly, this is φιλοτιμία in relation to the Demos, to one's fellow citizens, or, depending on the context of the action, it may be directed to one's fellow tribesmen, demesmen, or members of a private religious κοινόν. It is to love that τιμή which is the prize for benefactions, the communal reward given to one who benefits the community.[4] To state again MacDowell's excellent summary (1990.378–9), φιλοτιμία "refers not only to a state of mind but also to an activity for the purpose of gaining honour; and honour (τιμή) means praise, admiration, deference, and sometimes material rewards, given by other people in acknowledgement of such activity successfully undertaken." In our honorary texts that τιμή is expressed through praise. Such praise of one individual could also engender competition for similar τιμή among others, as is explicitly stated in a few texts.[5]

What all of this means is that when an individual in a public context sacrificed, supervised sacrifices, served as a hieropoios, epimeletes, agonothetes,

---

am correct, we have what motivated the individual to perform the act as he did, an important religious *datum*, not what motivated the audience to give the honors.

3 Refer to examples in Chapter 1.

4 φιλοτιμία is, in this period, good. μικροφιλοτιμία is bad. Diggle (2004. 405), in discussing Theophrastus *Char*. 21, defines μικροφιλοτιμία as "honour based on trivialities," and describes ὁ μικροφιλοτίμιος as "naively and innocently vain because he has a false sense of what is important." The individual who took great pride in and made a great show of, among other things, reporting (to the Boule?) the success of the prytaneis' sacrifice at the Galaxia to the Mother of the Gods was, according to Theophrastus, μικροφιλοτίμιος. The point is probably that he took excessive pride and made an inappropriate show in the reporting of a minor sacrifice, as he did in the bronze finger he dedicated to Asclepius and then assiduously tended.

5 On such "hortatory" clauses in honorific inscriptions, see Chapter 12.

or performed other religious duties,[6] he had one eye on the gods, one eye on his peers. He meant to please both.[7]

But for women, demonstrating φιλοτιμία towards fellow citizens may not have been thought appropriate or praiseworthy at the polis level.[8] This is apparent in the honors granted to the priestess of Athena Polias in *IG* II^2 776 of 237/6. Her φιλοτιμία is directed, unusually, only "to the goddess" (15–16),[9] and equally unusually in the hortatory clause she is praised for giving great importance to only εὐσέβεια, not εὐσέβεια καὶ φιλοτιμία (20–2). In the summation she is praised only for her εὐσέβεια (25–6) whereas, in the same text, her husband is praised for both his εὐσέβεια and φιλοτιμία (26–30). So, too, the priestess of Aglauros in 250/49 is honored solely for her εὐσέβεια towards the gods (*SEG* 33.115. 33).[10] Nowhere is a priestess honored with the phrase καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως widely used to commend the religious activities of men.[11] Perhaps the attitude of Pericles still prevailed, "Great is the reputation of a woman whose fame (κλέος) for virtue or censure is least widespread among males" (Thuc. 2.45) or, as Lambert (2012.81) puts it, "Partly it is because a priestess has no—or at least a limited—locus in the male world of the hurly-burly of Athenian politics, of the Council and Assembly and the whole business of competition for honour. In a sense of course these honorific decrees draw her a little into that world, but they draw her in only up to a point. A certain separateness and aloofness from the male arena is maintained."

---

6 The list of individuals honored for their φιλοτιμία in religious activities includes priests, epimeletai, hieropoioi, agonothetai, prytaneis, strategoi, astynomoi, ephebes and their kosmetai, demarchs and other deme officials, thiasotai, and orgeones.

7 If we add parents to the mixture, we have Lycurgus, *Leoc.* 15: "For you know in what you Athenians differ most from other people, τῷ πρός τε τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς γονέας ὁσίως καὶ πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα φιλοτίμως ἔχειν. On ὁσιότης in respect to parents, see Mikalson, 2010.148–50.

8 On all of this in regard to priestesses, see Lambert, 2012.80–1 and Chapters 1 and 2 above.

9 The same phrase is restored in *SEG* 29.135.9–10. The meaning of this phrase may be explained from the fuller form in *IG* II^2 1314.7–8 of 212/1, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐφιλοτιμήθη ὅσα προσῆκεν τῆι θεῶι. For φιλοτιμία directed to both the deity and the group, see, from private cults, *IG* II^2 1314.9–12, 1315.16–18, and, as restored, 1337.10–11.

10 Cf. the praise of the Athenian priestess of Athena Polias in *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #3.

11 Private groups were less reticent to attribute φιλοτιμία to their priestesses: thiasotai / orgeones of Mother of the Gods: *IG* II^2 1314, 1315, 1316 (for a husband and his priestess wife) and, perhaps, *Agora* 16.235; and, as restored, orgeones of Syrian Aphrodite, *IG* II^2 1337. Cf. the φιλοτιμία, much emphasized, of the epimeletria of the cult of Agathe Thea, *SEG* 56.203.

We have argued above that praise for φιλοτιμία in religious activities does not imply a financial contribution unless that is explicitly stated or is inherent in the office, as that of choregos. But some contributors are praised for their φιλοτιμία, and we can perhaps best understand the social and moral dimensions of such financial contributions through Aristotle's treatment of μεγαλοπρέπρεια, although this word and its cognates rarely, if ever, occur in Attic inscriptions. It has occasionally been restored, but usually wrongly.[12] For Aristotle μεγαλοπρέπεια concerns only expenditures of money in a certain way and for a certain purpose.[13] It is ἐν μεγέθει πρέπουσα δαπάνη, "expenditure fit, proper, or perhaps better conspicuous or distinctive in size."[14] ὁ μεγαλοπρεπής made such expenditures for the sake of the τὸ καλόν (τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα), not to show off his wealth, and does so happily and lavishly (ἡδέως καὶ προετικῶς).[15] μεγαλοπρέπεια involves an ἔργον, a task or deed, that is μέγα and καλόν, and those who observe it are filled with wonder (θαυμαστή). It is among those expenditures that bring "honor" (τὰ τίμια), like those concerning gods, that is, for dedications, buildings, and sacrifices, and similarly "about everything divine" (περὶ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον). These expenditures which are for the community are εὐφιλοτίμητα, an example of which is the *choregia*. ὁ μεγαλοπρεπής spends not on himself but for the public things (εἰς τὰ κοινά), and his gifts are something like dedications (*EN* 4.1122a18–1123a34).[16] Aristotle would hardly consider all our donors μεγαλοπρεπεῖς,[17] but the language he uses and that of our texts are remarkably similar: for Aristotle οἱ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς do what they do for the sake of τὸ καλόν and for τιμή; in our texts the donors are often praised

12 See, e.g., *IG* II^2 649.27 vs. *SEG* 45.101.27 and *IG* II^2 890.13 vs. *IG* II^3 1275.13. The one sure example is late, *SEG* 45.116 bis.16 of 98/7. *Agora* 15.81.7 of 267/6 is also a possible instance.

13 On Aristotelian μεγαλοπρέπεια in a democratic context, see von Reden, 2003.84–5. On μεγαλοπρέπεια in archaic and classical literature, see Kurke, 1991.167–82.

14 No single English word comes near to translating it. "Magnificence," in LSJ and commonly used by philosophers, is hopelessly inadequate. I therefore use the Greek term throughout. The adjective μεγαλοπρεπής is used of both the agent and the action. In prose authors it can characterize, among other things, entertainment of *xenoi* (Xen. *Oec.* 2.5, *An.* 7.6.3, and Hdt. 6.128.1); care of the dead (Isoc. 9.2, and Pl. *Hp. Mai.* 291e2 and *Menex.* 234c3); and, as in the epigraphic texts, performance of sacrifices and *heortai* (Hdt. 4.76.3, Pl. *Rep.* 2.362c2, Isoc. 7.29 and 16.34, Xen. *Cyr.* 6.2.6 and *Vect.* 6.1, and Arist. *Pol.* 6.1321a35–6); of liturgies (Isoc. 19.36); of the making of dedications (Pl. *Rep.* 2.362c2); and of the care of sanctuaries ([Dem.] 59.77).

15 Cf. ἀφειδῶς . . . καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς, used by his son to describe Alcibiades' expenditures for sacrifices and other elements of the *heorte* at Olympia, the Olympic Games (Isoc. 16.34).

16 Cf. *EE* 3.1233a31–b14.

17 Cf. Wilson, 2000.271.

for acting καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως. That μεγαλοπρέπεια occurs so rarely in our texts concerning donors is probably because it and the more usual expression of the same activity in our texts are slightly different ways of praising essentially the same thing.

The donors may well have been pleased by the "honor" they received, and for some this may have been enough. But we should not imagine that such donations were usually for the self-satisfaction of the donor or from a sense of altruism. The "honor" resulting from μεγαλοπρέπεια had its own returns (χάριτες) for the donor and often his family, and J. K. Davies (1981, especially 88–105) has collected and discussed the explicit references to these in the literary sources. In the fifth century we hear more of increased political power through elections (as for strategoi) and appointments.[18] In the fourth century we hear mostly of defendants bringing to the attention of juries their personal donations and expecting thereby to win the favor of the jury.[19] Davies and Kurke see a change in emphasis,[20] but it also may be partially a matter of a change of sources, with political sources dominant for the fifth century, oratorical sources for the fourth century.[21] Our inscriptions do not, for fairly obvious reasons, express the political or forensic χάριτες expected to result from the "honors" given to the donors, but we can expect, I think, that they would have been in the political and forensic areas as well as the social.

The Esthetic Dimension

καλὸν δ' ἄγαλμα πόλεσιν εὐσεβὴς πόνος
χάριν τ' ἔχει τὰν ἐς αἰεί.

EURIPIDES, *Suppliants* 373–374

Just as the inscriptions bring light to the social dimension of Athenian religious actions, they also provide an opening to an esthetic dimension of these same activities, that is, those elements in cult which were to appeal to the eye, to the eyes of the participants and, perhaps, to the eyes of the gods. By this

18 E.g., Lys. 19.56–7, Plut. *Nic.* 3.1–2, *Ath. Pol.* 27.3, and Thuc. 6.16.1–4, four of the examples emphasized by Davies, pp. 96–8. See also Hakkarainen, 1997.13–15 and Wohl, 1996.

19 E.g., Antiph. *Tetra.* 1.2.12, Lys. 25.12–13, Dem. 21.156, and Lycurg. *Leoc.* 139–40, again examples from Davies, pp. 93–5. For a complete list, see now Harris, 2013.387–99.

20 Davies, 1981.96–131 and Kurke, 1991.174–5.

21 Note, also, in the fourth-century oratorical sources how often orators rehearse their liturgies (Ober, 1989.226–33, esp. 230–33).

I mean not the "beauty" of representations of religious actions in sculpture and pottery, but the "beauty" of the religious actions and artefacts themselves. We here survey what we might term καλός and κόσμος expressions concerning religious actions and objects, especially as they occur in the inscriptions and texts already studied.[22] καλός in its various forms is particularly complicated, and we are fortunate to have David Konstan's excellent new book *Beauty* (2014) to guide us. The abstract noun κάλλος seems, almost always, to denote "visual beauty," of men, women, and objects, but its adjectival (and much more common) form καλός has a much wider domain, ranging from the physical to the abstract, from "beautiful" to what Konstan offers as "unusually attractive," "fine," "splendid," "brilliant," "excellent of its kind," "noble," "honorable," and "good" (31–62). "The context is what discriminates among the several senses of the term" (39).[23] Konstan offers a plethora of examples, especially concerning humans and works of art, from Homer through late antiquity. To each of these he attempts to assign the appropriate meaning and nuance, but rarely is the visual side of a καλός term completely submerged and "there is no doubt that in many cases 'beautiful' is a reasonable equivalent for καλός" (61). Konstan stresses that for some examples "order" and "proportion" are essential to the Greek concept of "beauty" (κάλλος) (103 and 106–8), but he does not offer specific treatment of the critical word here, κόσμος, which, like the καλός terms, has a wide range of meanings: in its nominal forms, "good order," "decoration," "adornment;" in its verbal forms, "to put in good order," "to decorate," "to adorn." Like "visual beauty" for καλός terms,[24] "order" seems central to the κόσμος terms and the other meanings develop from that. This is not the place, nor am I the person, to do a Konstan-type study of κόσμος terms, but I stress here, and we will see later, how "beauty" and "order" are closely related to and

22 The following is intended as an introduction to this esthetic dimension of Greek religion, one focused on the Athenian evidence. For some current work in this area, see Introduction, pp. 9–10. This esthetic concern was clearly a Panhellenic phenomenon, as Chaniotis' descriptions of, especially, *pompai* (2013.34–9 and 1995.158–9) indicate, and that and possible diachronic changes need to be investigated, but that is a topic for a separate book.

23 Konstan claims (39) that the "basic sense" of καλός is "fine" or "excellent," and that this basic sense, "when applied to physical appearance, naturally suggests the idea of beauty." I would propose, from Konstan's own examples and their nature and distribution over time, that its basic sense is of visual beauty, and that this was, in the broader and unique Greek esthetic, expanded over time to moral and other abstract areas. But there is no need to argue this (important) point here.

24 In what follows my uses of "adorn" are based on κόσμος expressions in the Greek.

are essential to the esthetic dimension of Greek religion. A well-ordered chorus or *pompe* is a thing the Athenians thought beautiful, a thing worth "seeing."

I trust that the expressions of beauty over a large range of religious practices and objects offered below will by themselves be sufficient to establish the esthetic dimension of these practices and objects. I hope they will also make plausible, if not definitively prove, our interpretation of the omnipresent adverb καλῶς as "beautifully" in a wide range of religious contexts. If, for example, a sacrifice is supposed to be καλή, it is likely, in my judgement, that an individual who is praised for sacrificing καλῶς is being honored for making it so. If this is so, the range and ancient appreciation of the esthetic dimension of Greek religion are significantly expanded.

We begin, as we began this book, with sacrifice.[25] One purpose of making detailed arrangements for sacrifices is thrice repeated, ὅπως ἂν γίγνηται ἡ θυσία ὡς καλλίστη, and the natural translation of this is, "so that the sacrifice may be 'as beautiful as possible.' "[26] The act of sacrifice itself has its own beauty. Socrates in [Pl.] *Alcibiades* II.148e5–149a4 can have the Athenians claim that "we perform" (ἄγομεν) the most and the most beautiful (καλλίστας) sacrifices of the Greeks, this in contrast to the Lacedaemonians who sacrifice animals that are ἀνάπηρα ("maimed"), something which Aristotle (frag. 101 [R^3]) claimed "we do not do." And here, to anticipate later conclusions, if my understanding of καλῶς in phrases such as καλῶς καὶ εὐσέβως is correct, we have abundant epigraphical evidence on the desirability of "sacrificing beautifully." And, as part

25 Naiden (2013) touches on but later (2015) stresses the importance of the esthetic element in sacrifice. I seek more consistency in the meaning of terms such as ὡς κάλλιστα and ἱερὰ καλά than he does, but we are in strong agreement on the importance—probably to both gods and men—of this esthetic element, and I offer more evidence in support of it.

26 As Shear (2001.74 and 86) renders it. Cf. Georgoudi (2007.100): "afin que le sacrifice soit 'le plus beau.' " Rhodes and Osborne, 2003 translate this phrase in *IG* II^3 447.5 as "in order that the sacrifice . . . may be *as fine as possible*," but, as Konstan (2014.32–3) notes, " 'fine,' which is perhaps the most common rendering of καλός in English today, evades the problem of the connection between καλόν and beauty." Naiden (2013.211) has "as handsome as possible," as part of an extensive treatment (210–17) of ὡς κάλλιστα in sacrificial contexts but later (2015.467) prefers "fair," "as meaning both 'handsome' and 'socially and morally acceptable,' " in accord with his concept of two senses of καλῶς in sacrificial contexts. Lupu (2005.154) has "in order that the sacrifice might be performed in the best possible way," suggesting that he is taking the adjective adverbially. The relevant texts are *IG* II^3 447.5–6, *IG* II^3 348.12–15, and *I. Eleusis* 85.5–6 and 20.

Naiden (2013.63–8) offers a variety of criteria, from one sanctuary or another, and from one time period or another, used in the selection of animals for sacrifice.

of some sacrifices, the ephebes were to "lift up" the victim "with good form" (εὐσχημόνως), no doubt contributing to the visual effect of the ritual.[27]

This emphasis on the "beauty" of the sacrifice is complemented by a similar emphasis on the "beauty" of the sacrificial victims. In the Homeric Hymns τὰ ἱερά, the sacrificial animals, for Demeter, Apollo, and Aphrodite are καλά, as are to be those for Zeus, Poseidon, and Athena in the *Iliad*.[28] In the 330's the hieropoioi of the annual Panathenaia are to sacrifice to Athena Nike a cow, "after making a selection from the beautiful cows" (προκρί[ναντες ἐκ τῶν] καλλιστευουσῶν βοῶν).[29] The ephebes (regularly), the father of a kanephoros, a priest of Asclepius, and government officials presented sacrificial victims (sometimes a specific animal, sometimes just θύματα) that were (ὡς) ὅτι κάλλιστα.[30] So the victims for sacrifice are, before they are killed, to be καλά or, better, ὡς κάλλιστα.[31] And the comic poets play on this, Aristophanes (*Ach*. 791–2) lewdly, κάλλιστος ἔσται χοῖρος Ἀφροδίτᾳ θύειν ("She will be a most beautiful pig to sacrifice to Aphrodite), and Menander (*Dys*. 567–8) sarcastically, καλὸν γὰρ τεθύκαθ' ἱερεῖον, πάνυ ἄξιον ἰδεῖν ("You have sacrificed a beautiful sacrificial victim, very worth looking at").

In preparation for the sacrifice these "beautiful" animals, especially cows, are to be further beautified with fillets, i.e., loose strands of wool with pieces of string tied around them at regular intervals, as described and illustrated by Van Straten (1995.43–5 and 161–2) in a section entitled "Beautifying the Beast." In our most extensive description of a sacrifice from Homer (*Ody*. 3.418–63), Nestor had the horns of the victim gilded, ἵν' ἄγαλμα θεὰ κεχάροιτο ἰδοῦσα (3.436–8).[32] Every word here is important: the goddess "sees" the victim, it is an ἄγαλμα, a thing of beauty, and therefore she feels *charis*, probably here pleasure and a sense of obligation to those who render her this *charis*.[33]

So, too, after the killing, when the animal is butchered, in the inspection for omens. If my interpretation of τὰ ἱερὰ καλά in Appendix 3 is correct, τὰ ἱερά

---

27 *IG* II^2 1008.11–12 of 118/7, *Hesp. Suppl*. 15, #6.13 of 101/0, and *IG* II^2 1029.9 of 94/3.

28 *Hymn* to Demeter, 29, to Apollo, 273–4, and to Aphrodite, 101, and *Il*. 11.727–9. Cf. *Il*. 23.195 and 209 and *Ody*. 4.472–3, 7.190–1, and 11.130. For this interpretation of τὰ ἱερά, see Appendix 3.

29 For some non-Athenian examples of such a selection procedure, see Chaniotis, 2013.35–7.

30 Hieropoioi of Panathenaia, *IG* II^3 447.46–7; ephebes, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.14–15 and 27–8, *Hesp. Suppl*. 15, #6.17–18, *IG* II^2 1029.11–12; father of kanephoros, *IG* II^3 1284.11–12; and government officials, *SEG* 21.469C.27. Cf. *IG* II^2 783.8–9.

31 So, too, of the victims of human sacrifice in literature, as in, Eur. *Hec*. 265–70 and 557–65. Cf. Hdt. 7.180.

32 Cf. [Pl.] *Alc*. II.149c1–2.

33 On this interpretation of κεχάροιτο, see Mikalson, 2010.14–15.

are the sacrificial victims, and, because they appear καλά ("beautiful") in the search for omens, the omens are favorable. The carcass of a slaughtered cow might not look beautiful to us, but then there are not many butchers among us and we are not used to rummaging through a dead animal's entrails, as the Greeks were, for good omens about important matters.

The Athenians also honored those who made their *heortai*, the Panathenaia, the City Dionysia, and their associated *pannychides* and *agones* ὡς κάλλιστα.[34] Individuals were also to participate in *pompai* or *agones* καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως, and the first adverb may well share the esthetic element of the second.[35] In terms of esthetics of such activities, i.e., the visual appearance of them, we should recall that Socrates and his companions in the opening of the *Republic* (1.327a1–5) talk of going to the *pannychis* of Bendis in Piraeus in order to "see" it (θεασόμεθα), and for Socrates the *pompe* of the locals was καλή. We owe to Xenophon's *Hipparchos* a useful Athenian description of *pompai*, and there the esthetic element is emphasized. The *pompai* are to be κάλλισται, "worth seeing" (ἀξιοθέατοι), and performed κάλλιστα.[36] "What is pleasurable (ἡδέα) to see in a mounted horse is to be displayed to the gods and humans," and the *pompai* are to be most "*charis*-creating (κεχαρισμενωτάτας) for both the gods and spectators. Xenophon wants things in *pompai* to be ἀγαθά, καλά, and ἡδέα for the spectators (2.1 and 3.1–5). Several individuals contributed to the κόσμος and beauty of the *pompai*. The demarchs "marshalled" (διεκόσμουν) the Panathenaia, probably meaning that each demarch marshalled his fellow demesmen, as the strategoi did the infantry and the hipparchs did the cavalry.[37] Lycurgus provided new κόσμος, gold jewelry, for one-hundred kanephoroi, themselves beautiful young women.[38] Dicaeopolis had his daughter serve as kanephoros for his little *pompe* in Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 253–4,

34 See Chaniotis, 2013.38. *Heortai*: Panathenaia, *IG* II^3 447.31–33 of ca.335–330, [Dem.] 24.28; Amphiaraia, *IG* II^3 348.12–13 of 332/1; Dionysia of Aixone, *SEG* 36.186.11–13 of 313/2; and Dionysia of Eleusis, *I. Eleusis* 70.11–12 of mid-IV BC *Pannychides: IG* II^3 447.57–9. Cf. *IG* I^3 136.27. Parker, 2005. 257, translates 58–9 of *IG* II^3 447 as "to perform as *fine* a *pannychis* for the goddess as is possible." Naiden (2013.213 and 2015.469) has "to make the gathering (sic) for the goddess as handsome as possible." *Agones: IG* II^2 682.54–6 of 276/5. *Pompai*: restored for a *pompe* of the Hephaisteia in *IG* I^3 82.24–5.

35 *SEG* 15.104.12–13, 23, and 131 and *IG* II^3 1176.14–15 and 1256.9–10. The prizes in the *agones* could also be καλὰ καὶ εὐσχήμονα (*IG* II^2 957.5–6).

36 On this aspect of *pompai*, see Chaniotis, 2013.34–9 and 1995.158–9 and Kavoulaki, 1999.299–301.

37 On this for the Panathenaia, see Shear, 2001.125–9.

38 Shear, 2001.130–2 and Mikalson, 1998.28–9. Ischomachus' wife also had special κόσμος for *heortai* (Xen. *Oec*. 9.6).

and he bid her, ἄγ', ὦ θύγατερ, ὅπως τὸ κανοῦν καλὴ καλῶς οἴσεις ("Come, daughter, be sure that you, beautiful, carry the basket beautifully"). Not only was she beautiful, but she was to perform her role καλῶς, and one can imagine many Athenian fathers giving the same advice to their daughters before a *heorte*.[39] The thallophoroi, the "carriers of the olive branches," were to be not just οἱ γέροντες, but οἱ καλοὶ γέροντες.[40] All, even the old men, contributed to the κόσμος and beauty of the *pompai*.

Many contributed also to the *agones* of the *heortai*. λαμπρῶς ("in a shining way," "splendidly") is the adverb often praising the activities of choregoi,[41] and it is they who provided the masks, costumes, and scenery for their productions. Demosthenes as choregos himself was outfitted splendidly, with a gold crown and a special robe.[42] The ephebes were praised for competing εὐσχημόνως in their races.[43] Isocrates (4.44–5), in his usual way, waxes lyrical over the value of such athletic *agones*: "When the Greeks gather together, it is possible for some to show off their good fortunes and for others to see them competing against one another, and neither group is disheartened. Each has that at which they may feel φιλοτιμία, the one group when they 'see' the athletes laboring for them, the other when they realize that all have come to 'see' them." And Athens, he claims, has the most and most beautiful spectacles (θεάματα πλεῖστα καὶ κάλλιστα). Finally, Xenophon in the *Oeconomicus* (7.9) has Socrates speak of an athletic or equestrian *agon* that is κάλλιστος, just as Phaedrus as agonothetes intended over 100 years later that the *agones* he supervised be "as beautiful as possible" (ὡς κάλλιστοι).[44]

One major purpose of expeditions to foreign *heortai* was "sightseeings," as their name, *theoriai*, indicates.[45] Aristotle (*Protrepticus*, frag. 12 [Ross]) claims that "we go abroad to Olympia for the spectacle itself (αὐτῆς ἕνεκα

39 On this scene, see Chaniotis, 2013.21.

40 Xen. *Smp*. 4.17 and Ar. *Vesp*. 540–5. On the thallophoroi, see Wijma, 2014.58–9.

41 Dem. 21.159, Lycurg. *Leoc*. 139, Antiph. *Tetra*. 1.2.12, Arist. *EN* 4.1122b23–4 and *Protrep*. frag. 2.8 (Düring). Cf. Thuc. 6.16.3. In the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (2.5) λαμπρῶς is linked directly to the spectacle (πρὸς τὸ θεωρεῖσθαι). On λαμπρός see Davies, 1981.98–100. It may be used of the person as in Dem. 21.159 or, more commonly, adverbially of the action done. The word is not used of the *choregia* or other religious activities in the inscriptions.

42 Wilson, 2000.86–9 and 97–8.

43 *SEG* 15.104.12–13, 23, and 131.

44 *IG* II^2 682.54–6 of 276/5.

45 Rutherford (2013) now provides a full and rich study of *theoriai* from their earliest Greek to latest Roman times, including the importance of "viewing" and "sightseeing" in them (esp. 4–6, 51–5, and 142–55). On the various Athenian *theoriai* see especially 304–23. In prose sources the "viewing" is central to the experience of *agones* of all types. See, e.g.,

τῆς θέας), even if there will be nothing more from it. For the viewing (θεωρία) itself is better than lots of money." So, too, he says of the Dionysia. Xenophon (*Hiero*. 1.11) talks of going to the Panhellenic *heortai*, "where all things which seem to be most worth seeing (ἀξιοθεατότατα) are collected together." Among the things "worth seeing" and "worth hearing" for Xenophon were choruses: "when each chorus member does a random move, confusion appears and it is unpleasant (ἀτερπές) to watch, but when they move and speak in an orderly way, these same chorus members seem to be "worth seeing and worth hearing."[46] Xenophon seems almost to provide commentary on Plutarch's (*Nic*. 3.4–5) description of the *theoria* led to Delos by Nicias, probably in 421 or 417:

> The choruses which the cities used to send to sing to the god landed (on Delos) in a chance way, and immediately a crowd met the ship, and the choruses were bidden to sing in no κόσμος, but in their haste disembarked in a disorderly way and at the same time put on their crowns and changed clothes. Nicias, when he was leading his *theoria*, landed at Rheneia (a closely adjoining island) with the chorus, the sacrificial animals, and the rest of the gear. He also brought a bridge which had been made in Athens of just the right size and adorned (κεκοσμημένον) splendidly with gildings, dyed coverings, garlands, and tapestries. During the night he bridged the small passage between Rheneia and Delos. Then, at daybreak, he disembarked, leading across the chorus that was expensively adorned (κεκοσμημένον) and singing.[47]

And the Delphians praised the Athenian technitai of Dionysus who participated in the Pythaïs of 98/7 because they "adorned" or "marshalled" (or both) (ἐπεκόσμησαν) the *pompe* καλῶς καὶ ἀξίω[ς τ]οῦ θεοῦ καὶ τᾶς πατρίδος τᾶς ἰδίας (*FD* 3.2.48.10).

For a summary statement we may turn again to the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (2.5) where Anaximenes suggests that one can argue for greater expenditures in religious matters ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ. The example he gives is the "splendor" of

---

Hdt. 8.26.2, Lysias 33.2, Xen., *Smp*. 1.2 and *Lac*. 4.2, Isoc. 4.44–5, Pl. *Lg*. 2.657d, and Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 171.

46 *Oec*. 8.3. Cf. *Vect*. 5.4, where Xenophon speaks of those who desire ἱερά that are ἀξιοθέατα.

47 On this event and Plutarch's description of it, see Rutherford, 2013.54. Xenophon (*Mem*. 3.3.12–13) has Socrates claim that the Athenian choruses sent to Delos are without rivals not because of their skill in singing or the size and strength of their bodies but because of their φιλοτιμία.

heortai and sacrifice, and that "splendor" is what is "seen," is in the "spectacle." For him this is at least one element of τὸ καλόν of religious activity. He distinguishes between the "beauty" and the "pleasure," which result from the "spectacle," but both are there. τὰ ἱερά are expected to be splendid, beautiful, and pleasurable.

Xenophon praises the "limitless stone" in Attica, the "stone" from which come "most beautiful temples, most beautiful altars, and most outstanding statues for gods (κάλλιστοι μὲν ναοί, κάλλιστοι δὲ βωμοὶ γίγνονται, εὐπρεπέστατα δὲ θεοῖς ἀγάλματα) (*Vect*. 1.4).[48] Apollo at Delphi had a temple which was κάλλιστος and μέγιστος (Dem. 25.34). About 432 the Athenians took various measures to make the sanctuary of Delian Apollo at Phaleron ὡς κάλλιστον.[49] The siting of temples and altars was also felt to have an esthetic element. In Xenophon (*Mem*. 3.8.10) the "place" is to be "most distinctive" (πρεπωδεστάτην) and "visible" (ἐμφανεστάτη) because it is "pleasant" (ἡδύ) to pray after seeing them.[50] Athenians are praised for "adorning" (ἐπικόσμησις and cognates) a sanctuary, and the purpose would be, obviously, to make them beautiful. So at the end of the second century BC Sosandrus was commended for his contributions to the "adornment" of sanctuaries, which he did, "offering no excuses, lacking nothing of eagerness or φιλοτιμία."[51] About 325 the Eumolpidae honor an individual who "adorned" the sanctuary of Plouton [κα]λῶς.[52] One may also "adorn" an altar or temple or statue in the sanctuary. The earth itself, Xenophon says, provides things (i.e., plants and flowers) with which humans adorn (κοσμοῦσι) altars and statues (*Oec*. 5.3). Every year, probably, the Athenians contracted out the adornment of the altar of Zeus Soter.[53] Neoptolemus gilded the altar of Apollo, and the adornment (κόσμησις) of the altar may have been a regular part of the Panathenaia and probably of all major sacrifices.[54] The family of the priestess of Aphrodite Pandemos adorned their temple with statues of

48 ὡς κάλλιστα is associated with construction, perhaps of the temple of Athena Nike, *IG* I^3 64.16 and 22 on which see Mark, 1993, esp. 139–41. For a ναὸς περικαλλής of Athena, see *IG* II^2 3464, for βωμοὶ περικαλλεῖς Hom., *Il*. 8.238 and 249 and [Dem.] 7.40, all poetic. For "beauty" as the criterion of a good building in general, see Pl. *Grg*. 514a5–c4.

49 *IG* I^3 130.8–9. Cf. *IG* I^3 138.15–17.

50 Cf. Arist. *Pol*. 7.1331a24–30 on sanctuaries.

51 *Hesp. Suppl*. 15, #16.5–9, 14–18.

52 *I. Eleusis* 93. For adornment ([κοσμή]σας) of the sanctuary of Asclepius, see *SEG* 25.226.40–2.

53 Mikalson, 1998.39.

54 [Plut.] *X. Orat*. 843f and *IG* II^3 447.54.

themselves, and the Dionysiastae adorned their temple "with many and beautiful dedications."[55]

Statues of gods, ἀγάλματα, are by their very name, ἄγαλμα, things of beauty.[56] Some are expressly labelled καλόν,[57] and, of course, they adorn sanctuaries.[58] And they themselves can be made more beautiful. Hyperides 4.24–5 of ca. 330–324 describes how the Athenians, at the oracular request of Zeus of Dodona, "adorned" the statue of Dione there: "Having made the face and all the other related elements as beautiful as possible (ὡς οἷόν τε κάλλιστον) and having prepared much expensive decoration (κόσμον) for the goddess . . ., you 'adorned' (ἐπεκοσμήσατε) the statue of Dione in a manner worthy of yourselves and of the goddess." With his dedication of 375–350 Dionysius adorns (κοσμεῖ) the hero Kallistephanos and the hero's children, and in 278/7 members honored their fellow thiasotai who adorned their goddess.[59]

Demosthenes (22.76 and [24].184) speaks of τὸ κάλλος of the dedications in Athens, and the κάλλος of those dedications is an "immortal possession."[60] Lycurgus provided "adornment" for Athena Polias: he restored solid gold Nikai and had made gold and silver processional vessels, and the gold jewelry for the 100 girl kanephoroi.[61] One *nomos* of ca. 335, proposed by Lycurgus, established various forms of new κόσμος for a number of deities, including Zeus Soter, Demeter and Kore, Zeus Olympios, Dionysus, Athena Itonia, Agathe Tyche, Amphiaraus, Asclepius, and Artemis Brauronia. One could also make existing dedications more beautiful. In the same text the Athenians voted to ask the oracle if they should make the "adornments" (κόσμους) sacred to Artemis of Brauron "larger and more beautiful (μείζους καὶ καλλίους) or leave them as they are now."[62] Dedications also needed to be repaired or remade, no doubt to make them or the resulting objects "beautiful." In 220/19 the priest of the Heros Iatros asked the Boule to melt down various old dedications in his sanctuary

---

55 *IG* II^2 4596 = *CEG* #775 and *IG* II^2 1325.21–2.

56 Keesling, 2003.10, 108–9, and 199, Wyse, 1904.468, and LSJ, s.v. On ancient descriptions of the beauty of statues, see Konstan, 2014.112–15.

57 καλόν, *IG* I^3 993, 1015. Cf. *IG* I^2 522. A tripod, in the eyes of its dedicator, can be a περικαλλὲς ἄγαλμα (Hdt. 5.60–1).

58 Is. 5.42.

59 *SEG* 55.307 and *IG* II^2 1277.8–9.

60 Some see "beauty" in the inscriptions themselves, that the stoichedon style, e.g., was introduced because it was "pleasing to the Greek eye." Meyer, 2013.460–1.

61 IG II^2 457 and Plut. *X Orat.* 852b, on which see Mikalson, 1998.20–30. And on Lycurgus' whole religious program as one of κόσμος, pp. 11–45, esp. 24, 29, and 31. See also Parker, 1996.244–5.

62 *IG* II^3 445.

and make from them a silver oinochoe. The new oinochoe is to be "as beautiful as they could make it" (ὡς ἂν δύνωνται κάλλιστον), and the purpose of all these arrangements is "so that, after these things have happened, the things relating to the gods may be καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς for the Boule and Demos."[63] Most common in our texts is the adornment of a "table," no doubt for a specific ritual and occasion as for Asclepius, Athena Polias, Aglauros, Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira of the city, Plouton, and Heracles.[64]

In [Pl.] *Alc*. 11.148e6–7 we have the Athenian claim that, "We have 'adorned (κεκοσμήκαμεν) the sanctuaries of the gods with dedications as no others have done,'"[65] and Dem. 22.13 speaks of the φιλοτιμία which the Athenians felt at the sanctuaries their ancestors had "adorned" from the spoils of the Persians. The sanctuaries and dedications, in turn, "adorned" the city. Isocrates (15.234) makes the remarkable claim that "Pericles so 'adorned' the city with sanctuaries and dedications and all the other things that even now those who come to the city think that it deserves to rule not only the Greeks but all others."[66] And, in more Machiavellian terms, an oligarchy can, according to Aristotle (*Pol*. 6.1321a37–9) maintain political control if, among other things, the Demos sees its polis "adorned" (κοσμούμενην) with dedications and buildings.[67]

εὐκοσμία shares all the denotations and connotations of κόσμος and indicates a desirable state of κόσμος. Given the close link between κόσμος and beauty and the concerns for the beauty of some religious activities we have seen, some praises of εὐκοσμία in our texts may have an esthetic element. The εὐκοσμία of the ephebes, for example, usually involves *pompai*, those who showed it in the *pompai* and in their entrances into the theater, or those who showed it in escorting Pallas to Phaleron and back.[68] εὐκοσμία was also a desideratum for sanctuaries, and officials who provided it were honored: epimeletai for the theater of Dionysus, a priest of Asclepius for Dionysus' temple, taxiarchs in times of trouble for the Demeter sanctuary at Eleusis, and epimeletai of orgeones for the sanctuary of their deity.[69] So, too, the Boule was once honored for

63 *IG* II^3 1154.33–4 and 43–5. Cf. *IG* II ^{2} 840.28–31.

64 Asclepius, *SEG* 18.19.19–20 and, restored, *IG* II^2 976.6; Athena Polias, *IG* II^2 776.10–13; Aglauros, *SEG* 33.115.29–30; Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, *IG* II^2 676.14–15 (cf. *Agora* 16.186.17–18); Plouton, *IG* II^2 1933.2 and 1934.3–4; and Heracles, 1245.5–6.

65 ἀναθήμασί τε κεκοσμήκαμεν τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν ὡς οὐδένες ἄλλοι. Cf. Is. 5.42.

66 For the same claim, but credited to "democracy" and not Pericles, see Isoc. 7.66.

67 On the "adornment" of the city in more general terms, see Kurke, 1991.163–94.

68 *IG* II^3 1313.89–90, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.11–12, and *IG* II^2 1008.9–10 and 1011.10–11. On the ephebes' trip to Phaleron, see Parker, 1996.307–8.

69 *IG* II^3 359.16–19, *SEG* 18.22.10–11, *Agora* 16.123.11–15, and *IG* II^2 1334.7–8.

overseeing the εὐκοσμία of the *heorte* of Dionysus.[70] Certainly not all instances of εὐκοσμία point to this, but I suspect that more underlies the above than just keeping "order." That "order" was essential to the beauty of the *pompai* and sanctuaries, and the beauty of both was a major concern.

The above examples of the concern for κόσμος ("adornment") and κάλλος ("beauty") in Athenian religious activities have led me to conclude that when the Athenians said someone had performed religious activities ἵνα ἂν ἔχῃ καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, the καλῶς had an esthetic dimension, "beautiful," that the Athenians wished their activities regarding the gods to be "beautiful." I would extend this also to the two most common adverbial phrases associated with religious actions, καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, when they involve sacrifices or sanctuaries, and, more generally, καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, which could be applied to virtually any religious action. And, as we saw before, in praises of religious action καλῶς is almost always there, and almost always first.[71] The esthetic dimension is almost always explicitly praised. Sacrifices, sacrificial victims, *heortai, pompai, pannychides, agones*, sanctuaries, altars, temples, and dedications were all "to look beautiful."

Finally, we saw earlier what was considered by Athenians ἄξιον τῶν θεῶν. ἀξίως τῆς θεᾶς (θεοῦ) is used of the performance of priestly offices, of the adornment of a statue, the holding of a Pythaïs and a *pannychis*, and in private cults of the performance of epimeletai, of a *pompe*, and of construction in a sanctuary.[72] ἄξιον τοῦ θεοῦ describes a building project in the sanctuary of Ammon that is also καλόν, and so, too, a bull that the ephebes in 122/1 sent for the Dionysia.[73] We saw earlier how the Athenians adorned the statue of Dione in Dodona "worthily of the goddess." They made her face "as beautiful as possible."[74] In literary texts phrases such as ἀξίως τῶν θεῶν are non-Athenian, rare, and late, but not much later than some of our inscriptions. There they are used exclusively of things that are "beautiful": flowery meadows, gardens, buildings, and Ganymede.[75] What is ἄξιον τῶν θεῶν, with few exceptions, is so because it is καλόν.[76] From this, we can perhaps venture a bolder conclusion,

70 *IG* II^3 306.22–3.

71 See Chapter 1.

72 See Chapter 1.

73 *IG* II^2 1282.7–8 of 263/2 and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.206–12, T26.13 of 122/1.

74 Hyp. 4.24–6.

75 Diod. S. 5.3.2 and 43.2–3, Heraclides, frag. 1.1.8–10, and Eratosthenes, *Cat*. 1.26.8–10.

76 In one of his choregic productions Cimon "adorned" a house-slave of his in the form of Dionysus. The boy was "most beautiful to look at and very tall" (κάλλιστος ὀφθῆναι καὶ μέγιστος). The Athenians were much pleased by "the sight" (τῇ ὄψει) and applauded for a long time. Cimon stood up and said that he thought it was not "religiously correct" (ὅσιον)

that the esthetic dimension of Greek religious activity was thought important to the gods as well as to their worshippers. Perhaps the Olympians, like the cloud-goddesses of Aristophanes (*Nub*. 299–313), wish to visit Athens "to see" (ὀψόμεναι), amongst other things, the "gifts" to the gods, high-roofed temples and statues, and the sacrifices and feasts at all seasons. We may owe much of the finest Greek architecture, sculpture, pottery, and poetry to the Greeks' belief that "beauty" pleased not only themselves but also the gods.

---

for a person "assigned" (or, in a non-technical sense, "dedicated"—καταπεφημισμένον) to a god to be a slave, and he set the young man free (Plut. *Nic*. 3.3).

Appendices

∵

APPENDIX 1

The Oracles of Demosthenes 43 and 21

Demosthenes 43

The speaker of Demosthenes 43 is making a claim for his son to an inheritance, and he introduces the laws of Solon and an oracle from Delphi on the obligations and prescriptions on performing burial rites to make his case for who are the legitimate heirs. He says to the clerk of the court, "Read out for me the things from the oracle of Delphi that was brought from the god so that you, (the jurors), may hear that it says the same things about the relatives as the laws of Solon" (66). There follows a document inserted into the text, purporting to be that oracle.[1] After the reading of the oracle, the speaker continues, "You hear, jurymen, that Solon in his laws and the god in his oracle say the same things, bidding the relatives to perform (the rites)[2] for the dead on the appropriate days" (67). The speaker's introduction and summary of the oracle lead us to expect a prescription for relatives to bury their dead on certain days, as previously described in the laws of Solon (62–3). What we have, instead, is this text (66):

Oracle I[3]

> Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ. ἐπερωτᾷ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων περὶ τοῦ σημείου τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ γενομένου, ὅ τι ἂν δρῶσιν Ἀθηναίοις ἢ ὅτῳ θεῷ θύουσιν ἢ εὐχομένοις εἴη ἐπὶ τὸ ἄμεινον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημείου. συμφέρει Ἀθηναίοις περὶ τοῦ σημείου τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ γενομένου θύοντας καλλιερεῖν Διὶ ὑπάτῳ, Ἀθηνᾷ ὑπάτῃ, Ἡρακλεῖ, Ἀπόλλωνι σωτῆρι, καὶ ἀποπέμπειν Ἀμφιόνεσσι˙περὶ τύχας ἀγαθᾶς Ἀπόλλωνι Ἀγυιεῖ, Λατοῖ, Ἀρτέμιδι, καὶ τὰς ἀγυιὰς κνισῆν, καὶ κρατῆρας ἱστάμεν καὶ

1 Canevaro and Harris (2012) examine forged *nomoi* and *psephismata* in Andocides 1, and the methodology they outline in pp. 98–100 for identifying forgeries is that which I have used in this Appendix. For a full account of such forged documents in several Demosthenic forensic orations, see Canevaro, 2013a.

2 For ποιεῖν one must assume, or, better, insert τὰ νομιζόμενα.

3 The text is of Dilts' OCT (2005), with only Ἀπόλλωνι ἀγυιεῖ changed to Ἀπόλλωνι Ἀγυιεῖ as Dilts has it in 21.52 and maintaining the manuscript's formulaic τὰς ἀγυιὰς κνισῆν for Dilts' τοὺς ἀγυιᾶς κνισῆν. In this oracle and Oracle III the manuscripts vary between the Attic / Ionic κατὰ τὰ πάτρια and the Doric καττὰ πάτρια, and likewise between μνησιδωρεῖν and μνασιδωρεῖν. Dilts has correctly restored κατὰ τὰ πάτρια and μνησιδωρεῖν in the Ionic clauses, καττὰ πάτρια and μνασιδωρεῖν in the Doric ones in both oracles.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_017

χορούς, καὶ στεφαναφορεῖν καττὰ πάτρια· θεοῖς ’Ολυμπίοις καὶ ’Ολυμπίαις πάντεσσι καὶ πάσαις, δεξιὰς καὶ ἀριστερὰς ἀνίσχοντας, μνασιδωρεῖν καττὰ πάτρια· ἥρῳ ἀρχαγέτᾳ, οὗ ἐπώνυμοί ἐστε, θύειν καὶ δωροτελεῖν καττὰ πάτρια· τοῖς ἀποφθιμένοις ἐν ἱκνουμένᾳ ἁμέρᾳ τελεῖν τοὺς ποθίκοντας καττὰ ἀγημένα.

With good fortune. The Demos of Athenians asks about the sign that occurred in the sky. It would be better after the sign if the Athenians do what and sacrifice or pray to which god? It is beneficial for the Athenians concerning the sign that occurred in the sky to sacrifice with favorable omens to Zeus Hypatos, Athena Hypata, Heracles, Apollo Soter, and to send to the Amphiones. Concerning good fortune to Apollo Agyieus, Leto, Artemis, and to fill the streets with the savor of sacrifice and to set up *craters* and dances, and to wear crowns in the ancestral way (καττὰ πάτρια). For all the Olympian gods and all the Olympian goddesses to remember their gifts (μνησιδωρεῖν), holding up their right and left arms in the ancestral way (κατὰ τὰ πάτρια). To sacrifice and to make gifts (δωροτελεῖν) in the ancestral way (καττὰ πάτρια) to the patron hero[4] after whom you are named. And for the relatives to perform (the rites)[5] for the dead on an appropriate day according to the instructions given.

Demosthenes 21

In his prosecution of Meidias for assaulting him when he was a choregos at the City Dionysia, Demosthenes wishes the jurors to consider Meidias’ act as ἀσέβεια as well as ὕβρις, and to support his claim he introduces oracles: “for you know, I suppose, that you make all these choruses and hymns for the god not only according to the laws about the Dionysia but also according to the oracles, in all of which you will find the response, similarly from Delphi and Dodona, to establish the choruses (χοροὺς ἱστάναι) κατὰ τὰ πάτρια and to fill the streets with the savor of sacrifices (κνισᾶν ἀγυίας) and to wear crowns (στεφανοφορεῖν)” (51). Demosthenes then has the oracles read, and concludes as follows: “There are, Athenian men, both these and many other oracles for the city, good ones. What then from these things ought you to think? That they order us to sacrifice the other sacrifices to the gods appearing in each oracle, but they respond to you in addition to establish choruses and wear crowns κατὰ τὰ πάτρια in

4 On “patron hero” for ἥρῳ ἀρχαγέτᾳ, see Kearns, 1989.150.

5 Again, one would expect τὰ νομιζόμενα. It is noteworthy that it is lacking in both Demosthenes’ text and the oracle.

addition to all the oracles that arrive. Clearly all the choruses that occur and the choregoi during those days we come together for the *agon* have worn crowns on your behalf in accordance with these oracles, similarly the one who is going to win and the one who will be last. Of the one who in hatred commits an act of *hybris* against any one of these chorus members or choregoi, and this in the *agon* itself and in the sanctuary of the god, shall we say he does anything else than commit an act of ἀσέβεια?" (54–5).

Between this introduction and conclusion by Demosthenes four oracles are inserted into the text (52–3), two apparently from Delphi, two from Dodona. The first, and only the first, is in dactylic hexameters.

Oracle 11[6]

> Αὐδῶ ᾽Ερεχθείδαισιν, ὅσοι Πανδίονος ἄστυ
> ναίετε καὶ πατρίοισι νόμοις ἰθύνετε ἑορτάς,
> μεμνῆσθαι Βάκχοιο, καὶ εὐρυχόρους κατ᾽ ἀγυιὰς
> ἱστάναι ὡραίων Βρομίῳ χάριν ἄμμιγα πάντας,
> καὶ κνισᾶν βωμοῖσι κάρη στεφάνοις πυκάσαντας.
>
> I say to (you) the Erechtheidae who inhabit the city of Pandion and who guide your *heortai* by ancestral laws. Remember Bacchus, and throughout your spacious streets all together establish a thank-offering to Bromios because of the harvest and create savor (κνισᾶν) on the altars, having covered your heads with crowns.

Oracle 111[7]

> Περὶ ὑγιείας θύειν καὶ εὔχεσθαι Διὶ ὑπάτῳ, {καὶ} ῾Ηρακλεῖ, ᾽Απόλλωνι Προστατηρίῳ˙ περὶ τύχας ἀγαθᾶς ᾽Απόλλωνι ᾽Αγυιεῖ, Λατοῖ, ᾽Αρτέμιδι, καὶ κατ᾽ ἀγυιὰς κρατῆρας ἱστάμεν καὶ χοροὺς καὶ στεφαναφορεῖν καττὰ πάτρια. θεοῖς ᾽Ολυμπίοις πάντεσσι καὶ πάσαις, {ἰδίας} δεξιὰς καὶ ἀριστερὰς ἀνίσχοντας, {και} μνησιδωρεῖν.

6 The text is Dilts'.

7 I have modified Dilts' text as follows: Προστατηρίῳ for προστατηρίῳ and elimination of his καί after στεφανοφορεῖν. His and MacDowell's καί after σπονδοφορεῖν is not necessary. In 43.66 each new set of deities is added in asyndeton, without the expected καί, and each entry is closed with καττὰ πάτρια or κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, indicating the proper divisions. The latter point suggests also that here κατὰ τὰ πάτρια should be taken with the preceding clause, not the following one, and should be the Doric καττὰ πάτρια (as Dilts has it). The καί before μνησιδωρεῖν should be excised, but its presence in the manuscript will be important for the discussion below.

Concerning health sacrifice and pray to Zeus Hypatos, Heracles, Apollo Prostaterios; concerning good fortune to Apollo Agyieus, Leto, Artemis, and on the streets set up *craters* and choruses and wear crowns in the ancestral way (καττὰ πάτρια); for all the Olympian gods and goddesses, holding up your right and left hands, remember their gifts (μνησιδωρεῖν).

Oracle IV[8]

Τῷ δήμῳ τῷ ᾽Αθηναίων ὁ τοῦ Διὸς σημαίνει. ὅτι τὰς ὥρας παρηνέγκατε τῆς θυσίας καὶ τῆς θεωρίας, αἱρετοὺς πέμπειν κελεύει θεωροὺς ἐννέα καὶ τούτους διὰ ταχέων, τῷ Διὶ τῷ Ναΐῳ τρεῖς βοῦς καὶ πρὸς ἑκάστῳ δύο βοῖ σῦς, τῇ δὲ Διώνῃ βοῦν καλλιερεῖν, καὶ τράπεζαν χαλκῆν καθιστάναι πρὸς τὸ ἀνάθημα ὃ ἀνέθηκεν ὁ δῆμος ὁ ᾽Αθηναίων.

The (oracle) of Zeus indicates to the Demos of Athenians. Because you have let pass the times of sacrifice and of the *theoria*, he orders you to send nine select theoroi, and to send them quickly; and to sacrifice with good omens to Zeus Naios three oxen and in addition to each ox two pigs, and a cow to Dione; and to set up a bronze table for the dedication which the Demos of Athenians dedicated.

Oracle V[9]

῾Ο τοῦ Διὸς σημαίνει ἐν Δωδώνῃ, Διονύσῳ Δημότῃ ἱερὰ τελεῖν καὶ κρατῆρας κεράσαι καὶ χόρους ἱστάναι, ᾽Απόλλωνι ᾽Αποτροπαίῳ βοῦν θῦσαι, καὶ στεφανηφορεῖν ἐλευθέρους καὶ δούλους, καὶ ἐλινύειν μίαν ἡμέραν. Διὶ Κτησίῳ. βοῦν λευκόν.

The (oracle) of Zeus in Dodona indicates: to perform rites for Dionysus Demotes,[10] and to mix *craters* and to establish choruses, to sacrifice a cow to Apollo Apotropaios, and both free men and slaves are to wear crowns and to have a holiday for one day. And to Zeus Ktesios a white cow.

---

8 The text is entirely Dilts'.

9 I offer two variants to Dilts' text here. Δημότῃ for the manuscript's and Dilts' δημοτελῆ, an adjective not appropriate in this context. Δημότῃ may not be correct either, but we would expect some epithet of Dionysus, both in general and because every other deity in the oracle has an epithet. Secondly, Dilts obviously mistakenly included the phrase ᾽Απόλλωνι ᾽Αποτροπαίῳ βοῦν θῦσαι in its original position after he had moved it (as MacDowell had, see below) to later in the oracle. I leave it in its original position.

10 On Dionysus Demotes here, see Parker, 1996.5 n. 17.

MacDowell (1990), to whose commentary and textual work on the oracles in Dem. 21 (*Against Meidias*) we owe much, considers the four oracles from that speech (II–V), though the most textually corrupt passages of the speech, genuine and, perhaps, relevant to the speech: "Presumably the texts in 52–3 come from a collection, kept in Athens, of oracles received by the Athenian people. They are not all closely relevant to D.'s argument, but perhaps they are the most relevant that could be found. The fact that they are only marginally relevant helps to reassure us that the texts are genuine, since a forger inventing oracles for this speech would have composed texts which fitted the speech more exactly; but it is possible that whoever put the documents into *Meidias* after D.'s death has selected the wrong oracles from the collection, not the ones that D. actually intended to be read here" (p. 270). For our purposes the important point is that MacDowell considers the oracles genuine and Athenian. Regarding the Delphic oracles, Fontenrose (1978), generally skeptical, put oracles I, II, and III into his "historical" category, with I as H29 and II and III as one or perhaps two oracles (H28), but with reservations about II to be noted below. Parke and Wormell (1956, vol. II, #282 and 283) treat I, II, and III at face value. And, most recently, Parker (2005.108) seems to accept Oracle I as genuine, and Bowden (2005.118, 123–4) raises no question about the authenticity of I, II, and III. Parke later (1967.84), writing in general of oracles inserted into Demosthenic speeches, suggests some caution: "The general opinion tends to the more cautious view that they are not authentic originals, but were composed and inserted by ancient editors of the speeches, *exempli gratia*, so as to fill out the gaps where the original documents were cited at the trial. But even if this view is accepted, it would be generally agreed that scholars who composed them did their work excellently. If they were dealing with decrees and other legal documents, they knew the correct formulae, and there is no reason to suppose that they were less well informed on religious texts."[11] I will agree that the oracular texts were inserted by later editors, but for several of the oracles discussed here I doubt whether we can say the editors "did their work excellently" and were well informed on religious texts.[12]

11 But Parke later in this book, as in 1956, goes on to treat these Delphic oracles as if they were genuine.

12 I generally agree with Harris (2008.105 n. 106) who writes of Oracles II, III, IV, and V that "the texts of these oracles are forgeries composed in the late Hellenistic or Roman period. About IV, though, I am uncertain. It may just be misplaced.

Oracle 1 (Dem. 43.66)[13]

Despite the widespread acceptance of this oracle as genuine, the problems are numerous and decisive against it,[14] the first being that only the last sentence offers the response that the speaker first asked for and then later summarized. The combination of sacrificing to the gods and performing burial rites for the dead in response to a sign is unparalleled and improbable. The last is clearly an awkward addendum, inserted to force this "oracle" to be relevant to this speech. The number of deities and others to be appeased as a result of one omen is also remarkable and unparalleled. And of those gods clearly identified by epithet, Athena Hypata and Apollo Soter are unattested in Athens.[15] "Setting up *craters* and dances" is appropriate only for Dionysus, and is clearly borrowed from a text concerning his *heortai*, not concerning a sacrifice in response to a sign. This whole oracle is at best a pastiche of oracular phrases, individual ones which we can isolate by dialect. The prescriptions concerning the sign in the sky are in Attic / Ionic; the next provision, περὶ τύχας ἀγαθᾶς, is in Doric; the next, concerning the Olympian gods, is in Attic / Ionic; and the last two, concerning the ἀρχαγέτᾳ ἥρῳ and the dead, are in Doric. Each, in all probability, is from a separate oracle. This is surely not one genuine oracle, and

13 On which see Parke and Wormell, 1956, #283; Fontenrose, 1978.H29; and Bowden, 2005.118–19.

14 For Zeus Hypatos in Athens, see Graf, 1985.202–3. Athena Hypata appears on a late dedication from Epidaurus (*IG* IV² 1.148) and elsewhere only in a Delphic oracle ordering sacrifices for the residents of Kallatis in Thrace in II BC (*SEG* 45.911. B 11.9). There Zeus Hypatos has been restored (B 11.8) to form a pair with Athena. Apollo Soter appears on a similar dedication from Epidaurus (*IG* IV² 1.149), and only there.

The problem raised by Bowden (2005.118–19) concerning the identity of the "founding hero," or better, "patron hero" (See p. 115 above) is chimerical. He posits Erechtheus and Theseus, and claims "they do not really fit the oracle's words." But Erechtheus certainly can be considered a ἥρως ἀρχηγέτης of Athens. See Oracle 11. Erechtheus, as one of the ten tribal heroes, was both ἀρχηγέτης (*Ath. Pol.* 21.6 and Ar., frag. 126) and eponymous, exceptional by being eponymous for both his tribe members and, as here, for the Athenians in general as the Erechtheidae. See Kearns, 1989.160.

15 Bowden, after discussing the "founding hero," notes that "none of the other gods listed were particularly significant to Athenians, and all of this suggests the possibility that the Pythia herself was responsible for suggesting the gods to be prayed to, rather than agreeing a list offered to her: her response, although it apparently might vary somewhat from response to response, was perhaps not always well tailored to the particular consulting city." (118–19). This explanation is not really satisfactory, because what good would an oracle be to Athenians if it ordered them to sacrifice to gods whose cults they did not have? A sacrifice requires an altar, and no cult is attested for Zeus Hypatos, Athena Hypata, or Apollo Soter in Athens.

some clauses in it may not even concern Athens. We cannot use it for determining Delphi's influence on Athenian religious affairs.

The recognition that this oracle consists of various unrelated phrases explains some anomalies: that such a large number of such varied deities are linked to just one celestial sign; that funeral rites for the dead are linked to sacrifices to deities and a hero; and that the establishment of a *heorte* of Dionysus is linked in this way to simple sacrifices to other deities. None of this makes sense in terms of Athenian religious traditions, and happily the evidence for it can now be discarded.

Oracle II (Dem. 21.52)[16]

There is little on the surface that is problematic about this oracle, apart from its immediate relevance to the speaker's argument which concerns choruses and choregoi, neither mentioned in the text. The text seems to be initiating a Dionysiac harvest *heorte*, more like the Rural Dionysia ("in the streets") than the City Dionysia that is Demosthenes' concern.[17] Directly relevant to the context, however, is the wearing of crowns, emphasized in the speech. Fontenrose (1978) includes it among his "historical" oracles (H28) in his "Catalogue of Delphic Responses," but in his text (187–8, 193–4) he raises the following questions about it. "It is colorless and hardly typical." "Of seven Historical verse oracles, six are very late, spoken between about AD 100 and 300. . . . Only H28 is early, supposedly spoken in the fourth century BC" And, most importantly, "It is strange that a fourth-century response instructs the Athenians to offer fruits and make sacrifices on altars to Dionysus." "H28 may be the composition *that purported to be* (emphasis mine) the divine order directing the introduction of Dionysus' cult to Athens." MacDowell (1990.271) thinks it "instructs the Athenians to hold an extraordinary festival for Dionysus in thanksgiving for the harvest." A single, extraordinary *heorte* to celebrate one harvest is, I think, unparalleled and unlikely.

Oracle III (Dem. 21.52)[18]

This is another version of Oracle I and subject to many of the same criticisms. But now, instead of a response to a celestial sign (Oracle I), the purpose is to attain health. Athena Hypata, and the Amphiones have disappeared.

16 See Parke and Wormell, 1956, vol. 1, 337–8 and vol. 2, #282; Parke, 1967.84–5; Fontenrose, 1978.H28; MacDowell, 1990.271; Bowden, 2005.123–4; and Harris, 2008.105 n. 106.

17 As noted also by MacDowell, 1990.271.

18 Parke and Wormell, 1956, #282; Parke, 1967.84–5; Fontenrose, 1978.H28; Bowden, 2005.123–4; and Harris, 2008.105 n. 106.

Apollo Prostaterios is substituted for Apollo Soter, certainly, as we have seen, an Athenian deity but receiving sacrifices only from the prytaneis and only after 273/2.[19] There is no other evidence, however, that he is associated with health, except that sacrifices to him—as to many other gods in this period—were made "for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos." The *craters* and dances clearly refer to Dionysiac *heortai*, but the god, oddly, is not named, and the phrasing in the manuscript suggests that the author intends these to be for "all the Olympian gods and goddesses,"[20] whereas in Oracle I they can be attributed to Dionysus. Dilts (2005) and MacDowell (1990.272) attempt to solve this anomaly by inserting καί after στεφανοφορεῖν and deleting it before μνησιδωρεῖν, thereby leaving the *craters*, dances, and crown-wearing for an unnamed Dionysus and the μνησιδωρεῖν for the Olympians.[21] This oracle has the same clauses in the same dialects as Oracle I. As to relevance to the speech, MacDowell (271) claims, "It does not pertain to the Dionysia, but it has a general relevance to D.'s case insofar as it shows that choruses have divine authority." This is not sufficient. This oracle has no value or use beyond that of Oracle I.

Oracle IV (Dem. 21.53)[22]

This oracle has no relation to the subject of the speech.[23] It is rather Dodona's response to an Athenian failure to send a timely sacrifice and *theoria* to a Dodonian *heorte*. The deities, sacrificial animals, and dedication all suit a genuine occasion and oracle.[24]

Oracle V (Dem. 21.53)[25]

This second oracle from Dodona looks to be another pastiche. The epithet of Dionysus, however restored, is unknown in Athens. What look to be elements of a Dionysiac *heorte*—sacrifice, *craters*, dances, and holiday—are interrupted

19 *Agora* 15.78.6 of 273/2. See Mikalson, 1998.115.

20 So Parke and Wormell, vol. 1.338 and Bowden (2005.124) take it.

21 See note on text of Oracle III above. The final word, occurring in an Attic / Ionic phrase, should be, as in Oracle I, μνησιδωρεῖν as Dilts has it, not μνασιδωρεῖν.

22 Parke and Wormell, vol. 1.338; Parke, 1967.84–6; MacDowell, 1990.273–4; and Harris, 2008.105 n. 106.

23 MacDowell (273) needs to stretch here: "It has nothing to do with the Dionysia or with choruses, and is really irrelevant to D.'s case, except that it reinforces the general point that the proper observation of festivals is important."

24 On Zeus Naios, see Parker, 2005.108 n. 64.

25 Parke, 1967.84–6; MacDowell, 1990.274–5.

by a sacrifice to Apollo Apotropaios, not a polis deity in Athens.[26] Both Apollo Apotropaios and Zeus Ktesios are random additions, the latter perhaps an attempt to establish a connection with Zeus Naios. This oracle has little value.

26 MacDowell (1990.275) attempts to solve this anomaly by moving the phrase Ἀπόλλωνι Ἀποτροπαίῳ βοῦν θῦσαι to after μιὰν ἡμέραν, thereby leaving the sacrifice, *craters*, dances, and holiday to an unnamed Dionysus. Dilts, surely by oversight, gives the phrase in both places.

APPENDIX 2

Demosthenes, *Prooemium* 54

> Καὶ δίκαιον, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ καλὸν καὶ σπουδαῖον, ὅπερ ὑμεῖς εἰώθατε, καὶ ἡμᾶς προνοεῖν, ὅπως τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς ἕξει. ἡ μὲν οὖν ἡμετέρα γέγονεν ἐπιμέλει' ὑμῖν εἰς δέον· καὶ γὰρ ἐθύσαμεν τῷ Διὶ τῷ σωτῆρι καὶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ τῇ Νίκῃ, καὶ γέγονεν καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια ταῦθ' ὑμῖν τὰ ἱερά. ἐθύσαμεν δὲ καὶ τῇ Πειθοῖ καὶ τῇ Μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, καὶ ἐκαλλιεροῦμεν καὶ ταῦτα. ἦν δ' ὑμῖν καὶ τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς τυθέντ' ἱέρ' ἀσφαλῆ καὶ βέβαια καὶ καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια. δέχεσθ' οὖν παρὰ τῶν θεῶν διδόντων τἀγαθά.
>
> It is just, καλόν, and serious for us also, as you have been accustomed to do, to take care that τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς ἕξει. For you our ἐπιμέλεια has been towards what is necessary. For we sacrificed to Zeus Soter and Athena and Nike, and these sacrificial victims have been καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια for you. And we sacrificed also to Peitho and the Mother of the Gods and Apollo, and were sacrificing also these (victims) with good omens. And for you also the victims sacrificed to the other gods were ἀσφαλῆ and βέβαια and καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια. Therefore accept τὰ ἀγαθά from the gods giving them.

A search in the prose and poetic texts of the classical and Hellenistic periods for the phrases, common in our epigraphical texts, καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια and τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς ἕξει leads only to this one Demosthenic prooemium.[1] The question is whether we can use this text to understand better the meaning of these and similar phrases in our inscriptions, that is, whether it is a reliable source for religious conceptions and practices of the period it purports to be, i.e., during the lifetime of Demosthenes. There are a number of anomalies. Of the fifty-six Demosthenic prooemia[2] only this one and #55 are, as Rupprecht

1 We are fortunate that his study of Theophrastus, *Char*. 21 has led J. Diggle (2004.23–5, 413–16) to look closely at this prooemium, and as usual he has much of value to offer. He does not, however, question this as a genuine text of the Demosthenic period, and in that and in the translation of some phrases, we differ.

2 As usually numbered. For a renumbering of the whole and of individual ones, see Yunis, 1996.259. I follow the numbering of the *OCT*.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_018

(1927.398–9) put it, "um keine Staatsrede oder politische Angelegenheit."[3] They are "ganz ausserhalb des Rahmens der Sammelung." It would appear to be the report of specially commissioned hieropoioi or, much more likely, of the prytaneis to the Boule or Ekklesia.[4] It is certainly modeled on the latter. The idea of ἱερὰ ἀσφαλῆ is to be found elsewhere only once, referring to a time when the τὰ ἱερά might have been in physical danger while crossing a river.[5] ἱερὰ βέβαια is unparalleled, and it is difficult to imagine what is intended. If the list of deities is accurate, it would be a welcome addition to the deities receiving sacrifices from the prytaneis. The Athena would probably be Athena Soteira, often paired with Zeus Soter.[6] Apart from here, an Athenian Nike as an independent deity is mentioned only in the problematical Themistocles Decree (M&L #23.39),[7] and otherwise there is no indication of a cult for her in Athens which had, of course, its own Athena Nike. The Mother of the Gods is appropriate because we know the prytaneis sacrificed at her *heorte*, the Galaxia.[8] It is surprising in light of the epigraphical texts that Apollo has no epithet.[9] It is also surprising to find in such company Peitho by herself, without the Aphrodite Pandemos to whom she seems a subsidiary in Athenian cult (Paus. 1.22.3).[10] Finally, the addition of ἐκ τῶν θεῶν διδόντων to the formulaic δέχεσθε τὰ ἀγαθά looks to be a misunderstanding of the meaning of τὰ ἀγαθά in the formula (i.e., that τὰ ἱερά were καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια),[11] confusing it with τὰ ἀγαθά as "the good things sent by the gods."[12]

---

3 As noted also by Worthington, 2004.134. Yunis (1996) in his valuable study of Demosthenic prooemia recognizes the uniqueness of *Prooemium* 54 but still attributes it with all the others to Demosthenes: "it looks authentic in diction and function and its presence in the collection weighs in favor of Demosthenic authorship" (p. 259). Yunis says of Demosthenic prooemia in general, "no imitator, no matter how good or close to Demosthenes, could perfectly imitate Demosthenes in style and substance while excluding all inappropriate or anachronistic elements" (p. 261). That may be true of the other fifty-five prooemia, but *Prooemium* 54, I think, introduces "inappropriate" elements. See also Wilamowitz, 1893.II.401–2 and Rupprecht, 1927.398–9.

4 In one instance (Antiphon 6.45), though, one who sacrificed for the prytany may have designated himself a hieropoios, and so the dichotomy may be false.

5 *I. Eleusis* 95.15–16 of ca. 321/0: ὅ[πω]ς τὰ ἱερὰ ἀσφαλῶς καὶ καλῶ[ς π]ορε[ύ]ηται[ι]. . . .

6 E.g., *Agora* 15.180.10.

7 Graf, 1985.164–5.

8 *Agora* 15.180.10.

9 As Wilamowitz (1893.II.401) noted.

10 On Peitho as a deity in the cult of Aphrodite in Athens, see Rosenzweig, 2004.19, Parker, 1996.234, and Pirenne-Delforge, 1994.26 and 74.

11 See above, pp. 86–8.

12 For such uses of both δέχεσθαι and τὰ ἀγαθά, see Diggle, 2004.416.

The author of *Prooemium* 54 knew superficially some of the appropriate formulae, probably from inscriptions, but may have misused the last one. Others he may have invented. He is correct that the prytaneis, or at least the prytaneis of one prytany each year, sacrificed at the Galaxia. They also sacrificed, once a year, to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, but not in the same prytany as the sacrifice to the Mother of the Gods, as the text would require it. It is unlikely that Peitho and Nike were independent deities in Athens in this period. In short, no one detail suffices, but the number of anomalies is enough to cast very serious doubt on this as a useful text for expanding our understanding of the epigraphical sources.

APPENDIX 3

Ἱερὰ Καλά

Van Straten (1995.1) translates the virtual title of his book, τὰ ἱερὰ καλά as "the holy things are beautiful." ἱερός is "sacred," "belonging to a god," and "holy" is not helpful for it or any Greek term. On this see Mikalson, 2010.6–7 and 11–12. Van Straten then speaks of "holy rites," and by that apparently means that the ἱερά are the rituals of sacrifice. From the arguments in Chapter 4, I think he is mistaken. θυσίαι refers to the acts of sacrifice, ἱερά in these contexts and especially in τὰ ἱερὰ καλά refers to the sacrificed animals.

The uncertainty over the meaning of τὰ ἱερά in τὰ ἱερὰ καλά is also endemic in the translation and explication of the literary sources. The currently favored translation is "the omens were favorable" as in Brownson and Dillery (1998) for *An*. 4.3.9. Cf. 2.2.3;[1] for Hdt. 9.36 in Strassler, 2007; and in Strassler, 2009 for Xen. *HG* 4.2.18 and 7.2.21. For Aristophanes *Av*. 1118, Sommerstein, 1987, (*ad loc*.) translates the phrase as "our sacrifice has been successful," but interprets it to mean that "the omens . . . have been favourable." Cf. Dunbar, 1995, *ad loc*. A similar phrase occurs in Thucydides (4.92.7), πιστεύσαντας . . . τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἃ ἡμῖν θυσαμένοις καλὰ φαίνεται, which Hornblower (1991–2008, *ad loc*.), in a long discussion, explains as "*hiera* in the narrow sense, the leisurely sacrificing and burning of the victim and then examination of the innards, perhaps in camp or on the march." He takes, apparently, ἱερά to be the act of sacrifice. And, so, are τὰ ἱερά the "victims," the "sacrifices," or the "omens," all three of which LSJ s. v. ἱερός proposes and translators use?

I would argue that not only in the phrase τὰ ἱερὰ καλά but also in most sacrificial contexts τὰ ἱερά are the "sacrificial victims." As examples, in the following passages ἱερά are commonly taken as "sacrifices" or "omens," but can just as easily, and more consistently, be taken to mean "sacrificial victims" as they are in the epigraphical texts: Hdt. 1.59.1, 5.44.2, 8.54, and 9.36; Ar. *Av*. 1118; S. *Ph*. 1033; Xen. *An*. 2.2.3; Herodas 4.79–83; and Antiphon 5.83.[2] "The omens

1 Implied also in Mikalson, 1998.43.

2 Antiphon 6.83. The defendant here claims that, when he "attended" or "stood alongside" ἱεροῖς, κάλλιστα τὰ ἱερά ἐγένετο. This he takes to be evidence that the murder charge against him is false, and it is probably to strengthen his argument that he uses κάλλιστα, the superlative uncommon in this phrase. The ἱρῶν of Hdt. 1.172.2 are "sanctuaries" (*pace* Purvis), as would seem to be those of A. *Th*. 1010 (*pace* LSJ). In Hdt. 2.63.1 ἱρά are distinguished from sacrifices (θυσίας) and may be "sacred rituals" of some type.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_019

were favorable" should be viewed more as an interpretation than as a translation. The full statement would be, "the victims were καλά, and therefore the omens were favorable." For Greeks the second statement would be the obvious conclusion from the first and would not need to be expressed.

For Homer, too, it is most likely that ἱερά and καλὰ ἱερά linked to the verb ῥέζειν and some other verbs in a sacrificial context are the "sacrificial animals," not "sacrifices." Lines such as *Il.* 11.727–9,

> ἔνθα Διὶ ῥέξαντες ὑπερμενεῖ ἱερὰ καλά,
> ταῦρον δ᾽ Ἀλφειῷ, ταῦρον δὲ Ποσειδάωνι,
> αὐτὰρ Ἀθηναίῃ γλαυκώπιδι βοῦν ἀγελαίην.

alone indicate that,[3] and ῥέζειν itself can bear the "sacrifice" meaning, as in *Il.* 10.292, σοὶ δ᾽ αὖ ἐγὼ ῥέξω βοῦν. So, I would claim, in Homer, too, ἱερά and καλὰ ἱερά in their many occurrences, should be rendered "sacrificial animals" and "beautiful sacrificial animals."[4]

σφάγια καλά

Hornblower (*ibid.*) describes σφάγια in much the same way as he does ἱερά, as sacrificial acts. On Thuc. 6.69.2, though, he has them as "victims." We have in Xen. *An.* 1.8.15 τὰ ἱερὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ σφάγια καλά, in Hdt. 6.112.1 τὰ σφάγια . . . καλά (Cf. A. *Th.* 379), in 9.61.3 τὰ σφάγια χρηστά (cf. τὰ ἱερὰ . . . χρηστά in Hdt. 5.44.2), and in 9.45.2 a nice variant, τὰ σφάγια . . . καταθύμια. The parallels with τὰ ἱερά suggest, given the previous discussions, that τὰ σφάγια are "sacrificial victims," either of different types or for different purposes from τὰ ἱερά. As such σφάγια gives an additional connotation and touch of pathos to passages such as Eur. *Hec.* 108–9 and 118–19, *Ion* 278, *Or.* 658, 815, and 842, and [Dem.] 60.29. As for ἱερά, virtually all the instances of σφάγια can reasonably be understood as "sacrificial victims" of one type, and none needs refer to the act of sacrifice. If we are correct, in these contexts both ἱερά and σφάγια are the sacrificial victims. It is they which are καλά.[5]

---

3 Cf. *Ody.* 3.5–6, 5.102, 11.130–1, and 23.277–80.

4 *Il.* 1.147, 23.195 and 209 and *Ody.* 1.61, 4.473, and 7.191.

5 On σφάγια as victims slaughtered but then not consumed by humans, as contrasted to ἱερά as we understand them, see Parker, 2005.154.

καλλιερεῖν

καλλιερεῖν is "to have one's ἱερά καλά," and in both inscriptions[6] and literary texts[7] is almost always distinguished from the act of sacrifice.[8] In the inscriptions καλλιερεῖν is, as in the literary texts, used absolutely, with no direct object.[9] The group being benefited (ὑπὲρ. . . .) is rarely specified (*Agora* 16.7.4–6, *MDAI* 66.228.4.4–6, *IG* II^2 1030.17, and Xen. *Hipp*. 3.1). In *Ath. Pol*. 54.6–7 the hieropoioi are to καλλιερεῖν with the manteis. We have, fortunately, two brief descriptions of καλλιερεῖν which suggest why it is necessary to determine if τὰ ἱερά are καλά or not: in Hdt. 6.82.1, in a process of καλλιερεῖν, one is "to use the victims" (τοῖς ἱροῖσι χρήσηται) and learn εἴτε . . . ὁ θεὸς παραδιδοῖ εἴτε ἐμποδὼν ἔστηκε. In Xen. *De Vect*. 6.3 it is reasonable, καλλιερήσαντας, to begin a new activity, σὺν γὰρ θεῷ (τῶν Ἀθηναίων) πραττομένων εἰκὸς καὶ τὰς πράξεις προιέναι ἐπὶ τὸ λῷον καὶ ἄμεινον ἀεὶ τῇ πόλει.[10] To have καλὰ ἱερά in a sacrifice means essentially that one knows one will be working "with a god" and not "against a god," that one's actions will lead to what is λῷον καὶ ἄμεινον which is, of course, also the common purpose of consulting an oracle.[11]

If we are willing to look away from Athens but to a contemporary of many of our inscriptions (III BC), Herodas in his Fourth Mime (4.79–84) may offer a bit more insight into the thinking behind these texts:

> κάλ᾽ ὔμιν, ὦ γυναῖκες, ἐντελέως τὰ ἰρά
> καὶ ἐς λῶιον ἐμβλέποντα· μεζόνως οὔτις

6 *MDAI* 66.228.4.4–5, *Hesp. Suppl*. 15, #6.5–7, 15–19, 31–2, *IG* II^2 1029.4–5, 11–12, 18–19, and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.14–15.

7 E.g., Hdt. 6.76.1–2, 7.113.2, 134.2, 167.1, 9.19.2 and 38.1–2; Xen. *HG* 3.1.17, 3.3.4, 4.1.22, *An*. 5.4.22, 7.8.5; Pl. *Lg*. 7.791a7–8; Aeschin. 3.131 and 152; and *Ath. Pol*. 54.6–7.

8 LSJ, s.v. καλλιερεῖν II, would have ἱερά (or "victims") occasionally as the subject. Of its various examples, the following, however, easily allow the more usual human subject: Hdt. 6.76.1–2 (Cleomenes), 7.133 (Spartans), and 9.38 (Hegesistratus). Hdt. 9.19.5–7 is problematic and has properly led some editors to emend the text. In the passive the verb may be rendered as, "τὰ ἱερά prove καλα" (Xen. *Lac*. 13.3, Men., frag. 264.8 [OCT]). MacDowell, 1990.274, is mistaken in defining καλλιερεύειν as "'to sacrifice well,' avoiding any ill-omened acts or circumstances."

9 καλλιερεῖν has a direct object in Dem. 21.53 for which see Appendix 1, Oracle IV. Another possible case is *Agora* 16.7.4–6.

10 Cf. Xen. *Cyr*. 6.4.12.

11 Fontenrose, 1978.221–2. This somewhat contradicts Naiden's (2013.110–11) claim that καλλιερεῖν did not give information about the future but was only an indication that the sacrifice was successful, i.e., was acceptable to the gods.

ἠρέσατο τὸν Παιήον᾽ ἤπερ οὖν ὑμεῖς.
ἰὴ ἰὴ Παίηον, εὐμένης εἴης
καλοῖς ἐπ᾽ ἱροῖς τῆισδε κεἴ τινες τῶνδε
ἔασι ὀπυιηταί τε καὶ γενῆς ἄσσον.

For you, women, τὰ ἱερά are perfectly καλά
And look towards what is better. No one more
pleased Paion than you.
Ie Ie Paion, for the καλὰ ἱερά may you be kindly
to these and, if there are any, to their husbands
and closer family.[12]

Here τὰ ἱερά (a cock) offered for sacrifice by the women visiting an Asclepius sanctuary are reported by the *neokoros* as being καλά and ἐς λῶιον ἐμβλέποντα, that is, the omens are favorable. He goes on to say, "No one more pleased Paion than you," and this appears to be the conclusion he draws from τὰ ἱερὰ that were not only καλά but "perfectly" so. He then invokes Paion, with the wish that he be "kindly" to them, their husbands, and their kin. The god's εὐμενεία towards them and their family members is based upon (ἐπί) the καλοῖς ἱεροῖς. If we choose to use this source, we might infer, *mutatis mutandis*, much the same for Athenians, that if their officials and priests sacrificed καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, if their ἱερά proved to be καλά, they were looking hopefully to having the deities "well intentioned" towards them and the Athenians at large.[13]

12 On this passage see Headlam and Knox, 1922.212–13.

13 For εὐμενής once in a similar context in an Athenian state document, see *IG* II^3 1292.29 of 184/3. For similar uses of the word and its cognates in IV BC oratory, see Dem. 4.45, Lycurgus, *Leoc.* 96, and Isoc. 4.28. Cf. Hdt. 2.45.3.

APPENDIX 4

Ὁσιότης

Unlike in literary and philosophical texts, ὅσιος and its cognates are quite rare and late on Athenian inscriptions.[1] No person is designated as ὅσιος, and no person is praised for acting ὁσίως.[2] In this Appendix I look at ὁσιότης, its cognates, and terms associated with it in Athenian inscriptions, in inscriptions from other cities in the same period, and in literary sources.

ὁσιότης and Cognates

The noun ὁσιότης, "religious correctness," is, in Athens, largely limited to philosophical works as in Plato's *Euthyphro*, the one sustained discussion of the topic. It is not found in real Athenian orations, but Isocrates employs it in a rhetorical moral essay (11.26 and 28), in an encomium imagined to be delivered at a *heorte* on Cyprus (9.51), and in a speech purported to be of Plataeans before the Athenian Ekklesia (14.22).[3] The earliest example in Athenian inscriptions is from 129/8 where the ὁσιότης is directed to the gods ([τῆς π]ρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὁσιότητος), as it is in some roughly contemporary inscriptions from elsewhere in the Greek world.[4] Philip V writes to the Athenians of Hephaestia ca. 200 about wishing to see their sanctuaries, διὰ τὴν πρὸ[ς] θεοὺς ὁσιότητα, and later refers to his εὐσέβεια[ν πρὸς] τοὺς κρείσσονας καὶ ὑ[περά]νω ἡμῶν θεούς.[5] In the two other surviving examples of ὁσιότης on Athenian inscriptions from

1 Blok (2011) has much of value on ὅσιος but is mistaken, I think, in putting on the ὅσια of the antithetical pair ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια all the religious connotations which ὅσιος itself might ever have. She follows Connor (1987) who also wrongly, I have argued (2010.205–6 n. 51), links ὅσια with "justice."

2 An interesting exception, one of those that helps prove the rule, is *IG* II^2 8593 = *CEG* #533, a self-congratulating epitaph erected in Piraeus by a Heracleote for his mother: μητέρα ἔθηκα ὁσίως ὁσίαν, τοῖς πᾶσιν ἰδέσθαι, ἀνθ' ὧν εὐλογίας καὶ ἐπαίνων ἄξιός εἰμι.

3 Cf. 12.121.

4 *SEG* 21.469C.8. From Delphi, *FD* 3.2.50.2–3; Tralles, *I. Magnesia* 85.12 of 208/7; and in a treaty of Acarnanian League and Anactorium in 216, *IG* IX^2 2.583.13–14, the earliest attestation of the noun in inscriptions.

5 *SEG* 12.399. The irony of Philip's interest in sanctuaries and claims to εὐσέβεια and ὁσιότης should not be missed. For his wanton destruction of Athenian sanctuaries, see Mikalson, 1998.190–4.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_020

our period, both late ephebic inscriptions, once explicitly and once implicitly the ὁσιότης of the *kosmetes* is directed not to the gods but to the ephebes themselves.[6]

ὅσιος, ὁσιώτερος, ὁσιώτατος

The comparative of ὅσιος is not found in epigraphical texts, and the superlative, as an adverb and linked with δικαιότατα, occurs only once, from Beroea in 180–150,[7] but one can, though rarely, as for εὐσέβεια, "increase one's ὁσιότης."[8] In literary texts, however, the comparative and superlative are common, adjectively or adverbally, in poetry and prose.[9]

οὐχ ὅσιος—ἀνόσιος

οὐχ ὅσιος is primarily a poetic form of ἀνόσιος, metrically suited to dactylic and elegiac poetry and hence found in epitaphs. In *SEG* 38.440 the deceased was probably murdered and hence he died οὐχ ὁσίως.[10] *I. Cos* EF 756 refers to obligations owed to parents, and *IG* XII 9.954 those to the dead, and both involve ὁσιότης. In the latter (line 9), we have οὐχ ὁσίη [κενεὰς τ]ῶιδε νέμειν χάριτας, and the phrase οὐχ ὁσίη may have an interesting pedigree. It occurs also in the stark, V BC warning on Delos, ξένωι οὐχ ὁσίη ἐσιέναι (*I. Délos* 68), and both this and the epitaph from Cos may be alluding to Homer, *Od.* 22. 412.[11] A sacred law from Ialysus on Rhodes, ca. 300, concerns the sanctuary of Alekrone, especially

---

6 Explicitly, Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.222–6, T30.66–7 of 116/5, ἀ[πο]δεικνύμενο[ι τὴ]ν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς γεγον[είαν ὁσιότη]τα. Implicitly, *Hesp. Suppl.* 15, #6.113 of 101/0, with the unusual phrase μετὰ πάσης ὁσιότητος, paralleled only in *I. Priene* 61.12.

7 *I. Beroia* 1.29.

8 From Delphi, *FD* 3.2.50.2–3 of either 106 or 97, and in the treaty of the Acarnanian League and Anactorium, *IG* IX^2 2.583.13–14 of 216.

9 In prose authors the comparative is not applied to persons, but to actions, words, and places: e.g., Thuc. 3.67.2, Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.5, *Ap.* 13, and *Cyr.* 7.5.56, Lys. 13.4, Antiph. 1.25, 5.91, and *Tetra.* 3.4.10, Isoc. 5.57, 12.170, 14.39, and 15.76, Din. 2.10, and Pl. *Cri.* 54b8. There the superlative of ὅσιος is, too, used mostly of deeds, words, and laws: Antiph. *Tetra.* 3.4.11 and 5.14 and 6.2, Is. 9.34, Lycurg. *Leoc.* 52, and Pl. *Meno* 81b6 and *Lg.* 6.767d2. Isocrates uses it also of persons (14.2 and 15.284) as does Plato, *Lg.* 9.877e1 (of families) and 12.959c1.

10 Too little of *IG* II^2 13092 = *CEG* #497 survives to determine the context, and Wilhelm's supplement (*SEG* 28.354) and Peek's (*SEG* 30.291) are pure conjecture. Cf. *MAMA* 5.108.8.

11 To which Callimachus also probably alludes, in *Aitia* frag. 75.5.

ἅ οὐχ ὅσιόν ἐντι ἐκ τῶν νόμων ἐσφέρειν οὐδὲ ἐσοδοιπορεῖν ἐς τὸ τέμενος. Note here that what is οὐχ ὅσιον is determined by the *nomoi* and that it all falls under the larger legal category of ἀσέβεια.[12]

ἀνόσιος is very rare in inscriptions, perhaps because it may have been thought harsher than οὐχ ὅσιος, and in both instances is linked to the deity whose interests are involved, Enyalios at Lindos ([ἀ]νόσιον ἔστω ποτὶ τô [θε]ô) and Zeus Eleutherios and Kuria Artemis at Termessus (ἀνόσιον αὐτὸν ε[ἶναι πρὸς Ἐλευθερ]ίου Διὸς καὶ Κυρίας Ἀρτε[μ]ίδ[ος]).[13] Only here are specific deities tied to expressions of ὁσιότης in this way.

Finally, the orators cheerfully toss around the adjective ἀνόσιος as a positive, comparative, and superlative.[14] It is not surprising then to find it on a few Cnidian curse tablets, but surprisingly only on them, usually concerning a deposit that was not returned. The curser writes, to give one example, ἀποδοῦσι μὲν αὐτοῖς ὅσια ᾖ, μὴ ἀποδοῦσι δὲ ἀν[όσια].[15] But what does it mean? Probably not that ἀνόσια happen to the defaulters. Rather that Demeter and Kore should judge all of this to be ὅσια if the deposited items are returned, ἀνόσια if they are not. The curser adds a religious sanction to any legal one.[16]

ὅσιος vs. ἱερός

ὅσιος means "religiously correct."[17] In *IG* I^3 52.A16, the tamiai were to manage "the gods' money." In this same early inscription (434/3) the money itself is ἱερά ("sacred," "belonging to a deity") (A29–30, B26). This prepares us for the distinction we later find between money, places, and things that are ἱερά or ὅσια, always in this order when the terms are paired.[18] Money that is ὅσια belongs to the city and is available for its use. Unlike money, places, or things that are

12 *IG* XII 1.677.9–12, 19–21, and 29–30. Cf. Hdt. 2.81.

13 Lindos, *I. Rhod. Peraia* 251.43–4 of 440–420; Termessos, *TAM* III 1.9–10 of II BC.

14 The positives are too numerous to list. ἀνοσιώτερος is used of actions, words, and places, not of persons, e.g., Aeschin. 3.191, Andoc. 1.23, Antiph. 1.5. But note Lycurg. *Leoc.* 77. The superlative is occasionally used of words (Hdt. 9.78.1, and Andoc. 1.19) and deeds (Hdt. 2.115.4 and 121ε2 and 8.105–6, Xen. *Hell.* 4.4.2, and Pl. *Grg.* 525d6 and *Lg.* 9.872d7), but most commonly of persons: Hdt. 1.159, Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.21 (of the Thirty, cf. 2.4.22), 4.4.3, and 7.3.6, Andoc. 1.116, Isaeus 4.19, Antiph.6.48 and 51, Dem. 19.156, 28.16, 33.10, and 53.3, Pl. *Prot.* 349d7 and 359b3, and Arist. *Pol.* 1.1253a35–6.

15 E.g., *I. Knidos* 149.9–10 and 152.B.3–4. On these tablets see Appendix 5.

16 For a full discussion of ὅσια on these tablets, see Appendix 5.

17 Mikalson, 2010.11 and *passim*.

18 An exception to the usual order is Dem. 23.40.

ἱερά, in this context τὰ ὅσια are under no religious constraints.[19] Therefore it is ὅσιον to use them for profane purposes. Here τὰ ἱερά are "the sacred things" and τὰ ὅσια "the non-sacred," however much it may seem to us to contradict other usages of ὅσιος.[20] So we have in financial records from the deme Ikarion ἀργυρίου ὁσίο distinguished from money belonging to Dionysus or Ikarios.[21] Much later, after 255, in Athens we find ταμίαι τῶν ὁσίων.[22] We find a ταμίας τῶν ὁσίων also on Samos and at Smyrna.[23] Among the honors given at Delphi is once ἀτέλεια τῶν ὁσίων.[24] The distinction between ἱερός and ὅσιος is nicely captured in a very early text (450–425) from Olympia which does not even contain the first term. It distinguishes between two fines: one is ὁσίαν, the other is [καθ(θ)υτὰν τôι Δὶ ʾΟλυνπίοι].[25] Not on Athenian inscriptions, but at Tegea one could distinguish in this way between places: εἴτε ἰν ἱερôι εἴτε ἰν ὁσίοι.[26] Similarly a demesman at Athens in early III BC was praised for λέγων καὶ πράττων τὰ βέλτιστα ὑπέρ τε τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν ὁσίων.[27] And, finally, at Labraunda and on Andros a new citizen got to share in καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων.[28] It may be a matter of chance survivals, but it appears that this particular distinction between ἱερός and ὅσιος disappeared after III BC.

ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως

The pairing of ὁσίως and δικαίως occurs rather late, in II BC, especially in praise of those engaged in legal proceedings as judges or arbitrators.[29] The applicability of δικαίως in such cases is obvious, that of ὁσίως less so. Where appearing

19 So, probably, the force of Lysias 30.25.

20 Mikalson, 2010.11 n. 39. Or, as Rhodes and Osborne have it for R&O #88.8–9, "sacred and profane."

21 *SEG* 54.57.13 and 17 of 450–425. On this see Humphreys, 2004.147–50.

22 *IG* II^2 793.12. In the first, the money belongs to Dionysus. In the second it is interesting that the money for the statue of Antigonus comes from "non-sacred" funds.

23 Samos, *IG* XII.6.1.129.22, and Smyrna, *IK Knidos* I.231.28 and 32 of late III BC or early II BC and *I. Smyrna* 573.II.58 of ca. 245.

24 *CID* 1.11.22–3 of ca. 380.

25 *IvO* 16.3–4.

26 *IG* V.2.4.21 of IV BC.

27 *IG* II^2 1215.7–9.

28 Labraunda, *I. Labraunda* 42.12 of III BC and Andros, *IG* XII.5.718.8–9. Cf. [Dem.] 59.104.

29 *FD* 3.1.362.27–8, *I. Priene* 60.7–9, *I. Mylasa* 101.42 and 127.8, and *ISE* 103.19–21. On ὁσιότης and δικαιοσύνη in the philosophical tradition, see Mikalson, 2010.187–207.

alone[30] or paired with δικαίως, it probably refers to maintaining an oath which in some, probably in all, cases the judges had to swear.[31] The grain importers of Samos, also in II BC, in their dedication to Hermes Eisagogos and Aphrodite Synarchis praised themselves for "having dealt with one another ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως."[32] The *syngeneis* of the Carian god Sinuri used the phrase in honoring financial officials of their cult.[33] On Iasos administrators handed over accounts and money to their successors, ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως (*I. Iasos* 93.7–9).[34] The gymnasiarch in Beroea was to swear: "I shall serve as gymnasiarch in accordance with the gymnasiarch *nomos*, and in those matters which have not been written up in the *nomos* I will use my own opinion [ὁ]σι<ώ>τατα καὶ δικαιότατα as I am able." (*I. Beroia* 1.26–9).[35] Here, as possibly in all the above, the reference to ὁσιότης may involve keeping the oath taken by the office holder. On decrees erected at Delphi the citizens of Lilaia twice ca. 208 praised soldiers of Attalus I who "made their stay καλῶς καὶ δικαίως καὶ ὁσίως," i.e., they did not violate any civil or religious laws during their stay there (*FD* 3.4.133.5 and 134.3–4).

Sometime in the years 120–100 Priene honored a fellow citizen, Moschion, son of Cydimus, for his many, long, and good religious and secular services to the state (*I. Priene*^{2} 64). In the preface to this long (383 lines) decree is the fullest account of one man's virtues, encompassing most of the terms we have been describing, including ὅσιος and δίκαιος, and indicating, as it were, their respective audiences (14–23):

---

30 E.g., *I. Sestos* 1.11–12 and, perhaps, *I. Mylasa* 891.2.

31 For oaths by judges and other parties in legal proceedings of the time, see, e.g., *FD* 2.1.362.15–46 and *SEG* 48.1089bis.18 and 1112.21. For oaths in arbitrations, see Ager, 1996.16 and her texts numbered 21, 37, 43, 62, 71, 129, 132, 137, 146, 158, and 163, of which only #71 (*FD* 3.1.362 above) has mention of ὁσιότης. In the philosophical tradition oaths are usually linked with εὐσέβεια, not with ὁσιότης (Mikalson, 2010.155–7).

The restorations of *IG* XI.4.1052.3–6, praising an ἐπικριτής, give an odd, unparalleled and highly improbable sentiment: ἐφρόν[τισεν ἵνα οἵ τε δαψιλεῖ]ς καὶ οἱ μὴ πολυωρο[ύμενοι ὁμοίως τῶν πολι]τῶν ἐπιμελείας τυγ[χάνωσι καθότι ἦ]ν ὅσιόν τε καὶ δίκαιον, ...

32 Grain importers, *IG* XII.6.2.597. For other officials so honored, see *I. Rhod. Peraia* 121 and *IG* XII.7.234.

33 *I. Sinuri* 9.30–2, 15.5–6, and 10.3, all from II/I BC.

34 To the same category belongs the individual, to be remembered for τᾶς ὁσίας . . . δικαιοσύνας, who guarded for 30 months the gold of *xenoi* and citizens σὺν καθαρᾶι . . . δίκαι. (Maiuri, *NSER* 19, ca. 200 BC, from Rhodes).

35 γυμνασιαρχήσω κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν γυμνασιαρχικόν, ὅσα δὲ μὴ ἐν τῶι νόμωι γέγραπται γνώμῃ τῇ [ἐ]μαυτοῦ χρώμενος ὡς ἂν δύνωμαι [ὁ]σι<ώ>τατα καὶ δικαιότατα. On this text see Lupu, 2005.249–68 and Gauthier and Hatzopoulos, 1993, esp. 55–57.

> Moschion the son of Kydimus has been from his first manhood a κα[λ]ὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς man and has lived εὐσεβῶς in respect to the gods and ὁ[σ]ίως in respect to his parents and those living with him in close association and intimacy and to all the other citizens. He has dealt with his fatherland δικαίως καὶ φιλοδόξως and in a manner worthy of the virtue and reputation of his ancestors, and he has through his whole life well attested εὐμένεια from the gods and εὔνοια from his fellow citizens and from those dwelling here. . . .[36]

Much can and has been said about this text,[37] but, to focus on the topics before us, we note that his εὐσέβεια is directed to the gods, his ὁσιότης to his parents, his family and associates, and to all remaining citizens,[38] and his δικαιοσύνη and φιλοδοξία (which would be φιλοτιμία in an Athenian context) to his country.[39] From all of these he has experienced εὐμένεια from the gods and εὔνοια from fellow citizens and other residents of Priene. A good life, indeed. In terms of the current discussion of the pairing of ὅσιος and δίκαιος, we conclude that both are concerned with humans, that ὅσιος indicates "religiously correct" behavior toward them and that δίκαιος indicates, probably, both legally and morally correct behavior.[40]

The combination ὅσιος and δίκαιος may not occur on Athenian inscriptions or in deliberative oratory, but it was familiar to Athenians, at least in IV BC. Antiphon three times uses ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως in closing pleas for acquittals in his *Tetralogies* (1.4.12, 2.2.12, and 3.2.9). Xenophon (*Ap.* 5) has Socrates say, "For what is most pleasant, I know that I have lived my whole life ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως."[41]

---

36 Μοσχίων Κυδίμου γεγονὼς ἀπὸ τῆς πρ[ώτης ἡλικίας ἀ]νὴρ κα[λ]ὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ βεβιωκὼς εὐσ[εβῶς μὲ]ν πρὸς θεούς, ὁ[σ]ίως δὲ πρὸς τοὺς γονεῖς καὶ τοῦ[ς συμ]β[ι]οῦντας ἐν οἰκ[ε]ιότητι καὶ χρήσει καὶ τοὺς λοιπο[ὺς] πολίτας πάντας, δικαίως δὲ καὶ φιλοδόξως προσε[νην]εγμένος τῆι πατρίδι καὶ καταξίως τῆς τῶν πρ[ογόνων] ἀρετῆς τε καὶ δόξης, διαμαρ[τ]υρουμένην ἐσχηκ[ὼς διὰ πάν]τος τοῦ βίου τὴν παρὰ τῶν θεῶν εὐμένεια[ν] κα[ὶ τὴν παρὰ τ]ῶν [σ]υμπολιτευομένων καὶ τῶν κατοικού[ντων εὔνοια]ν. . . .

37 See, e.g., Graf, 1995.105 and extensive bibliography in *I. Priene*^{2}.

38 Later in this document, in the context of performing sacrifices (26–30) and of activities in the local Panathenaia (281–3), he is praised for having given a καλὸν ἀπόδειγμα τῆς τε πρὸς θεοὺς ὁσιότητος.

39 Cf. *I. Priene*^{2} 55.11–12 and *IG* XII.7.233.7–9.

40 Gauthier and Hatzopoulos (1993.55) rightly say of this phrase, "La *junctura* ὅσιος καὶ δίκαιος est classique. La traduction en est malaisée, voire impossible. Le terme ὁσιότης, dont on a beaucoup discuté, avait une connotation à la fois religieuse et morale, d'ailleurs variable selon les contexts et les périodes."

41 ὅπερ γὰρ ἥδιστόν ἐστι, ᾔδειν ὁσίως μοι καὶ δικαίως ἅπαντα τὸν βίον βεβιωμένον.

Less surprisingly, Isocrates uses it of his own speeches in the *Antidosis*, 15.321: "I know that I have used them ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως concerning the city, concerning our ancestors, and especially concerning the gods, so that, if the gods have any concern with human affairs, I think that nothing of what is happening concerning me now escapes their attention."[42]

Concerns for ὁσιότης and δικαιοσύνη abound in Platonic literature. For Plato the individual who is ὅσιος καὶ δίκαιος has, given his understanding of these terms, the complete moral package,[43] but I cite here only two passages as a conclusion to this topic. In the *Gorgias* (523a5–b2) Plato has Socrates say, "In the time of Cronus there was this *nomos* about humans, and it still even now exists among gods, that the one who has passed his life δικαίως and ὁσίως, when he dies, goes off to the islands of the blessed and dwells in all *eudaimonia*, free from evils."[44]

Finally, we conclude with Cephalus' famous words to Socrates from the *Republic* (1.331a3–8), with a quote from Pindar: "In a charming way, Socrates, Pindar said this, that whoever lives his life δικαίως καὶ ὁσίως, 'Sweet hope attends him, a nurse to his old age, nourishing his heart, the hope which especially guides the much turning thought of mortals.' "[45]

εὐσέβεια καὶ ὁσιότης and Cognates

At home an Athenian could be praised for acting εὐσεβῶς. At Delphi he could be termed εὐσεβῶς καὶ ὁσίως διακείμενος.[46] So, too, the Delphians described Attalus II in 160/59 and their benefactors in general.[47] The pairing of εὐσέβεια

42 οἶδα γὰρ ἐμαυτὸν οὕτως ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως κεχρημένον αὐτοῖς καὶ περὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ περὶ τοὺς προγόνους καὶ μάλιστα περὶ τοὺς θεούς, ὥστ᾽ εἴ τι μέλει τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων αὐτοῖς πραγμάτων, οὐδὲ τῶν νῦν περὶ ἐμὲ γιγνομένων οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς οἶμαι λανθάνειν. Isocrates also uses the phrase ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως also in oratorical-style essays, 3.13 and 9.26 and 38.

43 For this see Mikalson, 2010. 187–207.

44 ἦν οὖν νόμος ὅδε περὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ Κρόνου, καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἔστιν ἐν θεοῖς, τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν μὲν δικαίως τὸν βίον διελθόντα καὶ ὁσίως, ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσῃ, εἰς μακάρων νήσους ἀπιόντα οἰκεῖν ἐν πάσῃ εὐδαιμονίᾳ ἐκτὸς κακῶν.

45 χαριέντως γάρ τοι, ὦ Σώκρατες, τοῦτ᾽ ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν, ὅτι ὃς ἂν δικαίως καὶ ὁσίως τὸν βίον διαγάγῃ,
γλυκεῖά οἱ καρδίαν
ἀτάλλοισα γηροτρόφος συναορεῖ
ἐλπὶς, ἃ μάλιστα θνατῶν πολύστροφον
γνώμαν κυβερνᾷ.

46 *FD* 3.2.33.2 of 128. Cf. 3.2.92.4–5 and 9–10.

47 *CID* IV.110.6 and *FD* 3.1.152.9 and 12 of 150/49.

and ὁσιότης, though unattested in Athens, is common elsewhere, usually with εὐσέβεια preceding ὁσιότης. One may be praised for acting εὐσεβῶς or εὐσεβῶς καὶ ὁσίως, but rarely ὁσίως alone. εὐσέβεια is clearly the dominant concern. The earliest (before 246) example of the pair is, again, from Egypt and the technitai of Dionysus, followed by a response to the invitation to the Magnesian Leukophryena in 208/7.[48] For the Delians Ptolemy VI was ὅσιος καὶ εὐσεβὴς καὶ πάντων ἀνθρώ[πων] ἡμερώτατος.[49] In the Troad Hermias, priest of all the gods, πρ[ό]ς τε τοὺς θεοὺς ὁσίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς προσφέρεται.[50] The Athenian who in a proxeny decree of the Delphians ca. 151 is praised, in lines 4–5, as being εὐσεβὴς and ὅσιος is again praised in lines 9–10 [ἐπί τε τᾶι ποτὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐ]σεβείαι καὶ ὁσιότατι.[51] I note here and earlier whether these terms were directed to gods or humans. In short, when an object is specified, εὐσέβεια in our texts is always directed to the gods, the god, or the divine. ὁσιότης, however, may be directed to either the gods, as we have seen, or, somewhat unexpectedly, to humans.[52] The Colophonian praise of the chresmologue Menophiles is a clear example of the distinction: διά τε τὴν πρὸ[ς θεοὺς εὐσέβει]αν καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ὁσιό[τητα].[53]

Similarly the wife of Attalus I (269–197) and mother of Eumenes II (197–158), now dead and divinized, had demonstrated her virtue, διὰ τὸ κεχρῆ[σθ]αι καὶ [θε]οῖς εὐσεβῶς καὶ γονεῦσιν ὁσίω[ς].[54] So, too, of Moschion of Priene, βεβιωκὼς εὐσ[εβῶς μὲ]ν πρὸς θεούς, ὁ[σ]ίως δε πρὸς τοὺς γονεῖς καὶ τοὺ[ς συμ]β[ι]οῦντας.[55] On an undated tombstone from Melos, Cleonymes praises his father βεβιωκότα τὰ μὲ[ν πρὸς θεοὺ]ς [ε]ὐσεβῶς, τ[ὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν π]ατρίδα κα[ὶ τοὺς πολ]είτα[ς] ὁσίως [και π]ρὸ[ς] ἐμὲ δὲ [φιλο]στόργ[ως].[56] The reason for this, for εὐσέβεια directed to the gods but for ὁσιότης directed sometimes to gods but other times to humans, lies in the essential meanings of the words.[57] εὐσέβεια is "proper respect" for the gods and is manifested in

48 Technitai, *I. Prose* 6.6–7 and Leucophryena, Rigsby #107.26.

49 *I. Délos* 1518.5–7 of ca. 154.

50 *IMT* 183.3 of II (?) BC. For other examples from II/I BC, see *I. Stratonikeia* 9.13–14 and 103.3–4, *I. Mylasa* 141.1, and *I. Halikarnassos* 15.5.

51 *FD* 3.2.92, of which the restorations of lines 9–10 are assured by *FD* 3.3.249.11–12, *Sylloge*^{3} 737.11–12, and *BCH* 1949.276. #27.9. See also *FD* 3.1.152.11–12 of 150/49: τᾶς ποτὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείας καὶ ὁσιότητος χάριν.

52 See above for ephebes.

53 *SEG* 42.1065.8–9 of 200–150.

54 *I. Hierapolis* 30.6.

55 *I. Priene*^{2} 64.15–17 of 129–100.

56 *IG* XII.3.1121. Cf. 3.511 from Thera.

57 On what follows see Mikalson, 2010. *passim*.

actions such as sacrifice and prayer specifically directed to them. ὁσιότης, as "religious correctness," has a broader range. It may mean that one performed his acts of εὐσέβεια in the right manner, and this is probably the import of the praise ἐπὶ τῆι πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβείαι καὶ ὁσιότητι and the like. In addition, ὁσιότης is the condition of not having committed any of the various crimes under religious sanction, and these include stealing sacred property and maltreating parents. The gods take an interest in and may punish such crimes, but the actions are not directed primarily against them but, e.g., against parents or *xenoi*.[58] So, here, ὁσιότης can refer to the human affected, and the cases above specify which class of humans is so affected.

58 For a more complete list, see Isoc. 12.121–2 (killing of brothers, fathers, mothers, and *xenoi*, incest, and other such awful crimes portrayed in tragedies). For more mundane ones, see Mikalson, 2010.144–50.

APPENDIX 5

Curse Tablets from Cnidus and Ὁσιότης

Thirteen curse tablets were excavated at Cnidus, most from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, all probably to be dated to II or I BC.[1] They are the only tablets which express a concern for ὁσιότης. In all cases the curser was a woman.[2] These tablets have longer or shorter versions of much the same form, but it varies somewhat based on the perceived injustice. The curser "consecrates" or "dedicates" (ἀνιεροῖν, ἀνατιθέναι) the opponent(s) to Demeter, Kore, and associated gods. The perceived injustice is then detailed. If the injustice involved a deposit or missing or stolen objects, in the fullest form the curser asks for the return, usually in the form of "bringing" the object to Demeter and Kore. If the perpetrator does not do this, then there is the wish he or she not find Demeter "kindly" (εὐείλατος). Then we have the phrase of particular interest for our purposes, ἀποδοῦσι μὲν αὐτοῖς ὅσια ἦ, μὴ ἀποδοῦσι δὲ ἀν[όσια]: "After they have given (them) back, may things be "religiously correct" for them, but if they have not given them back, may things be not "religiously correct."[3] Here, because the perpetrator has somehow been "dedicated" to Demeter and her associated deities, because this all plays out in a sanctuary, because the object is to be "given," surely only temporarily, to Demeter, and because of the deity's involvement, the theft of a garment or failure to repay a deposit—things gods usually do not worry about—becomes a religious matter, of concern to the

1 *I. Knidos* 147–59.

2 The best treatment of these texts is Versnel, 1991.72–4. See also Faraone, 2011 and Gager, 1992.188–190. Versnel offers a translation of #148, Gager of 147, 150, and 159, and Faraone of 148, 149, and 150.

3 The η of #149.A.9 and #150.B.12–13 (restored in #157.6) appears as ηη in #150.A.6, probably by dittography, but is omitted in otherwise parallel passages (#147.B.1, 148.A.16–17, 149.B.6–7, 151.7 and 11, 152.B.3). The form must be, despite its appearance, an optative of εἰμί, perhaps hyperdoric in origin, an optative of wish as is, in the same context, the [γέ]νοιτο of #153. A.17–18 and B.1–2. No subjunctive construction suits any of the relevant passages. One should not treat it as an error of mood by the writer, in part because it is found on at least two tablets, in part because the optative of wish is used correctly and often on these tablets. Much the same applies to the ει of #152.A.5 which, too, is probably an optative, as is suggested by the τύχοι of B.7.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_021

deity.[4] For the perpetrator not to rectify the loss becomes a religious crime, i.e., ἀνόσιον, and the hope is that his or her relationship with the deity will suffer.[5]

Thus far only the cursee runs the risk of behaving ἀνοσίως. That is unique on curse tablets, but even more remarkable is that the curser is concerned about his or her ὁσιότης and, occasionally, that of his or her children.[6] For the curser him- or herself (ἐμοί), two concerns are expressed, that all this be ὅσια for the curser but ἀνόσια for the perpetrator. Otherwise put, on one tablet the curser is concerned that all of this be καθαρόν for him.[7] All of this, again, is understandable only because the site is a sanctuary and cult deities are involved. Or the curser wishes that it be ὅσια for him or her to "drink with," "eat with" ("or go to the same table"), "go into the same building," or "go to the bath" with the perpetrator.[8] Such restrictions one usually associates with dealings with murderers, but here because the agent of injustice is ἀνόσιος, for the reasons given above, the curser thinks that his or her own ὁσιότης may be affected by such intercourse. All of this, I think, arises because of the context of these tablets, that is, the presence of a sanctuary and the involvement of cult deities.[9]

---

4 ἐνθύμιον ἔστω Δάματρος καὶ Κούρας, #150.B.7. On the possible more specific sense of ἐνθύμιον here, see Karila-Cohen, 2010.

5 The meaning of ὅσια in these texts has, I think, been often misunderstood. Versnel (1991.72) has it right, "May I be . . . innocent of any offense against religion." Recently, though, Eidenow (2007), using the older texts and enumeration of Audollent (1904), translates #147.B.1 as "innocent of any profanity" (p. 388), #150.B.6 as "innocent" (p. 388), and the same expression in #151.11–12 as "let there be blessings for. . . ." (p. 389). Newton (1863.725), the first to publish the texts, was close with his translation of this phrase in #147: "May it be lawful for me. . . . ," but without the religious element. So, too, Faraone, 2011. I do, however, disagree with Newton's claim that the phrase "is intended to exempt the author of the curse from all liability to be involved in its consequences" (388). I likewise disagree with Gager, 1992.190 n. 53: "The language suggests some reluctance on the part of the client to undertake the action of commissioning the *defixio*, whether because of its illegality, its social unacceptability, or perhaps simply because of its great contagious power." The problem addressed by the phrase is religious, not legal or social, and has nothing to do with reluctance to make the *defixio*.

6 For children as well, #151.7, 11–12 and 153.B.8–9.

7 #159.7–8.

8 "Drink with," #148.B.1 and 155.8–9; "eat with" or same table, 147.B.5–7, 148.B.2, 153.B.6–7, 154.23; "same building," 147.B.3–5, 148.B.3–4, 150.A.6, 153.B.4–5, 154.23–4, 155.10–11; and "bath," 147.B.1–2. On this type of expression and its use here see Versnel, 1991.73 and 98 n. 67.

9 Faraone (2011) would associate these texts specifically with the Thesmophoria at Cnidus.

APPENDIX 6

Some Non-Athenian Praises of Religious Actions

One could "show εὐσέβεια" (εὐσέβειαν δεικνύναι) in religious matters, but rarely in Athens. In literary texts it is found only in Isocrates 11.27 (τὴν αὐτῶν εὐσέβειαν ἐπιδεδειγμένους) of early IV BC and then not again until Diod. S. 4.39.1 of I BC. The one sure example in Attic inscriptions is instructive. In *IG* II^2 680.5–6 of 250/49 from Athens, the phrase is probably taken from the invitation of the Aetolian League to participate in the Soteria at the invitation of the Aetolian League.[1] Outside of Athens it is used of states, most fully by the Cnidians of Cos (*I. Cos* ED 77.1–3 of ca. 200): [τοῦ δ]άμου δ[ιὰ πα]ντὸς ἀποδεικνύμενου τὰν ὑπάρ[χουσαν αὐ]τῶι διὰ προγόνων ποτὶ τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβει[αν].[2] The phrase may also be used of individuals,[3] but seems never to have developed into a formula.[4] In II BC one could also "make a showing" (ἀπόδειξιν ποιεῖσθαι) of one's εὐσέβεια, but again not in Athens. The phrase was used by the technitai of Dionysus at Opous and is found at Lindos and at Priene, the last in a unique form: τῆς ἑαυτοῦ καλοκἀγαθίας ἀπόδ[ε]ιγμα τὸ κάλλιστον διδοὺς εὐσεβείᾳ.[5] At Delphi the ἀποδείξεις might be πολλαὶ καὶ μεγάλαι.[6] If the restorations are correct, *RC* 9.9–10 would have this phrase, [πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἀ]ποδείξεις, earliest by about 100 years (281/0), in a letter from Seleucus I and Antiochus. The rarity of these phrases in Athenian inscriptions may be another indication that they were hesitant to ascribe permanent εὐσέβεια to an individual.

εὐσεβῶς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς διακείμενοι is found in various forms, first in III BC. The largest cluster then is in the responses in 208/7 to the invitation of Magnesia on the Meander to cities throughout the Greek world to participate in the new *heorte* and games of Artemis Leukophryene. The invitees so praise themselves[7]

1 Above, p. 28. If the extensive restorations of *IG* II^2 1265.3–4 are correct, we have a private association in Athens praising a tamias for "showing εὐσέβειαν," and this, ca. 300, would be the earliest attested epigraphical example.

2 Cf. *I. Stratonikeia* 512.4–5 from Lagina.

3 *SEG* 33.675.5, *IG* XI.4.1061.10, XII.5.481.8–9, and *I. Sinuri* 10.9–11.

4 The phrase has been restored in *FD* 3.1.482.9 where it is impossible. εὐσέβειαν linked with πλείστην is never found. Here one should think rather of [σπουδὴν].

5 Technitai, *IG* IX.1.278.5–6 = Aneziri, 2003, #B11; Lindos, *I. Lindos* 252.2; Priene, *I. Priene*^{2} 65.33–6.

6 *FD* 3.2.94.7–8. Cf. 3.3.383.4–5.

7 Achaean League, Rigsby #39.38–9 and three unknown cities, #112.14–15, 113.17–18, and 107.25–6.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_022

or the Magnetes.[8] The phrase is so common in these texts that it must have been included in the original invitation, as is also suggested by *I. Magnesia* 100a.16–17 where the Magnetes so describe themselves in a revival and reorganization of their *heorte* of Artemis Leukophryene.[9] In inscriptions the technitai of Dionysus are first attested to have used the phrase, before 246, in praising a benefactor, in Egypt, a man who they claim πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τοὺς ἀ[λλους θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς καὶ ὁσίως διακείμενος τυγχάνει (*I. Prose* 6.6–7 = Aneziri, 2003, #E2 = Le Guen #61). He is crowned ἕνεκα καὶ εὐσεβείας τῆς εἴς τε βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεούς (18–19). One of Ptolemy's generals is also praised in Samothrace for ε[ὐσεβῶ]ς διακείμενος πρὸς τοὺς θεούς (*IG* XII.8.156. 4–5) in 240–221, and in Smyrna King Seleucus himself is so praised ca. 245 (*I. Smyrna* 573.1.6). The link of the early examples to Egyptians may or may not be relevant as to the source of the spread of the phrase, as also the link to the technitai of Dionysus. Isocrates, in any case, could use the phrase of the Athenians for an international audience, with his usual penchant for superlatives (here εὐσεβέστατα), as early as 380 (4.33),[10] but otherwise the phrase is not found in Athenian literary or state epigraphical texts.[11] In II BC the phrase becomes more common, especially at Delphi in praising individuals, peoples, and kings.[12] Other examples are from Asia Minor and the Aegean islands.[13] The only others are one each from Egypt, Oropus, and Argos.[14]

---

8 Technitai of Dionysus, *I. Magnesia* 89.11–12 of ca. 204/3 and Epidamnus, Rigsby #96.4. On the background to these texts, see Rigsby, 179–85.

9 Cf. *IG* IX.2.1109.8–9. On the various attempts to date *I. Magnesia* 100a, either ca. 190 or ca. 130, see *SEG* 40.999.

10 Cf. 8.135, Theopompus, *FGrHist* 115 F 344, and Heraclides Ponticus, frag. 46b (Wehrli).

11 The two sure examples, *Agora* 16.324 and 325, of 112/1 and 111/0, are both from a private, non-Athenian cult devoted to the Megaloi Theoi of Samothrace, that is, from a region that at this time was using the phrase. On the cult see Mikalson, 1998. 254 and 277. The restoration [πρὸς] τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβῶ[ς διακείμενον] of *IG* II^2 994.3 of 224–220 is probable, and it is noteworthy that this, like the Magnesian texts, looks to be a response to an invitation to games, perhaps picking up the language of the invitation. The three Athenian exceptions thus tend to support the rule that the Athenians did not use the phrase.

12 *FD* 3.1.152.9, 2.33.2–3, 3.242.11–12, 4.49.4, 4.52.2–3, 4.77.7, 4.431.3–5, *CID* IV.110.6, and *SEG* 18.189.2–3.

13 Asia Minor: Sardis, *I. Sardis* 4.14–15, 22.5–7; Teos, Anizeri D3 on which see Rigsby, p. 281; Panamara, *I. Stratonikeia* 9.13–15; Halicarnassus, *JHS* 14 (1894).377–80.2–4; and Metropolis, *SEG* 32.1167.4. Aegean Islands: Cos, *SEG* 50.766.43, *I. Cos* ED 146.4–6; and Delos, *I. Délos* 1520.7–8.

14 Memphis, *I. Prose* 25.8–9; Oropus, *I. Oropos* 294.15; and Argos, by technitai of Dionysus, *IG* IV 558.1–2.

APPENDIX 7

Athens and the Cult of Eleusinian Demeter

We bring together here the evidence and descriptions, scattered throughout the book, of the involvement of the Athenian polis in the cult of Demeter at Eleusis. The polis exerted far more control and authority over this cult than over any other, and did so from the time of Solon at least. The nature and extent of this authority serve as an example of what polis control over a cult would look like if it were in fact common.[1]

Nomoi and *Psephismata*

There are by far more *nomoi* and *psephismata*, that is acts of the Ekklesia, concerning this cult than for all other individual cults combined. Kevin Clinton (1980 and 2005–2008) summarizes the content of *I. Eleusis* 138 of, probably, 353/2–348/7 as follows: the announcement of the Mysteries and the selection and sending of the spondophoroi to the other Greek cities; the limits and nature of the Sacred Truce surrounding the festival; the behavior of the cities toward the spondophoroi and the report of the latter on their mission; regulations concerning the *myesis* (the initiation preliminary to participation in the Mysteries); the appointment of the epimeletai, their duties and those of the basileus in managing the festival; the duties of the exegetai before the festival; the selection of the hearth-initiate; and (after a long lacuna) regulations pertaining to the initiates and *pompe*; legal procedures for various infractions; and the general responsibilities of the epistatai. "The original document," he claims, "may have covered every aspect of the Mysteries on which it was appropriate at this time for the Athenian State to legislate." The motivation for this *nomos* at this time, as Clinton plausibly suggests, is renewed foreign interest and more foreign visitors after the Peloponnesian War, a "desire to attract them and . . . a concern for their well-being after their arrival." Clinton puts this law into the context of other legislation concerning Eleusis, some reaching back to Solon.

1 On the epigraphical evidence for the cult at Eleusis in the late Hellenistic period, see Deshours, 2011.136–49. For a survey of changes in the Mysteries from their founding until III AD, often in the context of τὰ πάτρια, see Patera, 2011.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004319196_023

This text and its apparent predecessor, *I. Eleusis* 19 of ca. 470–460, are sufficient to document the intense involvement of the Ekklesia in the administration of the Demeter cult, going far beyond anything we see for other cults. It is noteworthy that both were erected in the Eleusinion in Athens, not at Eleusis, and, of course, the construction of the Eleusinion on the slope of the Acropolis is perhaps the best indicator of the unusual concern of the polis with this Eleusinian cult.[2]

Other *nomoi* and *psephismata*, including some of the earliest surviving, reflect concern with these same elements. *I. Eleusis* 13 of ca. 500 orders the hieropoioi of the Eleusinians to make specific sacrifices to various Eleusinian deities, probably as preliminaries to the celebration of the Mysteries themselves. *I. Eleusis* 30 of ca. 432/1, found at Eleusis, concerns the election, pay, duties, and term of annual epistatai at Eleusis, who are now to oversee annual revenues that come to sanctuaries of Demeter at Eleusis. By 149/8 various *psephismata* governed the initiation fee of the Eleusinian Mysteries (*I. Eleusis* 233.11–17). *I. Eleusis* 250 of II/I BC in its surviving portions treats especially the *pompe* for the Mysteries. Other surviving *nomoi* and *psephismata* also concern the *aparche*. In the mid-430's the polis, by a *psephisma*, revised a number of provisions concerning the *aparche*, including among other things the determination of the amount and, most notably, the requirement that all allied states make it and the request that all Greek states do it (*I. Eleusis* 28a). In 353/2 nomothetai revised arrangements of the *aparche*, and they are expressly revising "the *nomos* of Chaeremonides about the aparche" (*I. Eleusis* 142 of 353/2). In other matters, Demosthenes 21.10 and 175–6 gives the *nomos* of Euegoras preventing restraint for debt during the Mysteries and certain other *heortai*, and by a *psephisma* of 422/1 the polis at its own expense built a bridge over one of the Rheitoi, so that "the priestesses may carry τὰ ἱερά as safely as possible," surely in the *pompe* from Athens to Eleusis for the Mysteries (*I. Eleusis* 41).[3] Noteworthy here is the *nomos* proposed by Lycurgus ([Plut.] *X. Orat*. 842a) not allowing women to ride on wagons to the Mysteries.

2 On all matters concerning the Eleusinion in the city, see Miles, 1998.

3 Other *nomoi* and *psephismata* in Clinton's list (2005–2008.II.447–8) which are of our time period, of the polis, and concern cult matters are *I. Eleusis* 135 of IV/III BC, 188 of 251/0, 199 of 227/6, 206 of ca. 220, and 237 of ca. 120. The sacred calendar of Eleusis is *I. Eleusis* 175.

The Boule

The Boule met at Eleusis during the Mysteries (*IG* II^2 1072.3), and there was a *nomos*, going back to Solon, requiring that it meet in the Eleusinion in Athens on the day after the Mysteries (Andoc. 1.111 and 115–16). It supervised the ἀπαρχαί and supervised and made numerous sacrifices at Eleusis, on behalf of Demos (*I. Eleusis* 142), appointed epistatai to take charge of funds of the cult (Rhodes, 1972.93), received distribution of meat from hieropoioi (*IG* II^3 1164.25–6), and received at least occasional reports from the epimeletai of the Mysteries (*I. Eleusis* 181), the hierophant (*SEG* 19.124), and the demarch of Eleusis (*I. Eleusis* 229). It honored the epimeletai of the Mysteries of 215/4 (*IG* II^3 1164) and in at least three years dedicated *phialai* at Eleusis (*IG* II^2 1544.47–50). In 329/8 it ordered an *aresteria* for Demeter and Kore at Eleusis (*I. Eleusis* 177.431–2).

The (Archon) Basileus

The *Athenaion Politeia* (57.1) assigns to the basileus supervision of the Mysteries with the epimeletai of the Mysteries and the Eumolpidae and Kerykes.[4] In [Lysias] 6.4 it is expected that the basileus will sacrifice κατὰ τὰ πάτρια in the City Eleusinion and in the sanctuary at Eleusis and will supervise the *heorte* at the Mysteries, "so that no one commits an injustice or shows lack of respect concerning the sacred things." *I. Eleusis* 138.27–50 of mid-IV BC, though very fragmentary, reveals the centrality of the basileus along with the epimeletai of the Mysteries in punishing malefactors at the Mysteries.[5] From *I. Eleusis* 250.43 of II/I BC he had a role in the arrangements of the *pompe*. The basileus also reported to the prytaneis on performance of the Mysteries after the event (Andoc. 1.111), probably in anticipation of the meeting of the Boule held in the Eleusinion after the Mysteries.

4 Cf. *I. Eleusis* 138 of mid-IV BC. In *I. Eleusis* 100 of late IV BC the paredros of the basileus is praised for his supervision of matters concerning the Mysteries in association with the basileus and the *genos* of the Kerykes. On the role of the basileus in the Mysteries, see Carlier, 1984.330–1.

5 On this see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.121–2.

The Epimeletai of the Mysteries

At the time of the *Athenaion Politeia* there were four epimeletai of the Mysteries elected by the Demos, two from all the Athenians, and one each from the Eumolpidae and the Kerykes (57.1–4).[6] They were, along with the basileus, Eumolpidae, and Kerykes, to administer the Mysteries κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[7] *IG* II^3 1164 of 214/3 praises two of these epimeletai for a variety of activities, including supervision of the "march to the sea," the reception of Iakchos, and the Mysteries at Agrai, and because of the sacrifices they made to Demeter and Kore and associated gods (10–16, 20–23).[8] In *I. Eleusis* 181 of 267/6 two epimeletai report the sacrifice which they made at the Mysteries in Agrai (7–19). In this text the epimeletai also supervised the sacrifice at the Great Mysteries (19–24), and *IG* II^3 1329.7–12 of 173/2 has been restored in a probable way to have them personally making sacrifices at both the Great Mysteries and the Mysteries at Agrai. In II/I BC they were involved in the arrangements for the *pompe* (*I. Eleusis* 250.37 and 43–4). They also had a major role in giving fines or sending to court the disorderly at the Mysteries.[9]

Among the other polis cults that had epimeletai, only the epimeletai of the Mysteries appear to have contributed their own funds.[10] The most generous of these was Xenocles who had built, spending his own money, a stone bridge so that τὰ ἱερά might travel "safely and καλῶς," as well as the participants in the *panegyris*, and so that the residents and farmers might also be safe.[11] In 267/6 the epimeletai of the Mysteries sacrificed "from their own funds" τὰ σωτήρια to Demeter and Kore on behalf of the Boule and Demos.[12] The epimeletai of the Mysteries in 214/3 prepared a team of oxen for transporting τὰ ἱερά,[13] sent for the Eleusinia a bull as a victim, and, more generally, spent "from their own funds" for all the other things that were appropriate for the sacrifices.[14]

---

6 On the duties of the epimeletai of the Mysteries, see Clinton, 1980.280–3 and 2005–2008. II.120–1 and 261–5, Rhodes, 1993.536–8, and MacDowell, 1990.389–90. Clinton (2005–2008. II.265) suggests that the number of epimeletai "may have been reduced early in the Hellenistic period, with only those from the Eumolpidae and Kerykes retained."

7 *I. Eleusis* 138.A29–30 of mid-IV BC. Cf. *Ath. Pol.* 39.2 and 57.1.

8 Cf. *I. Eleusis* 192.9–16 of 249/8 and *IG* II^3 1188.2–6 of ca. 215.

9 *I. Eleusis* 138.31–3 and 250.29–35.

10 On their contributions, see Hakkarainen, 1997.23–4.

11 *I. Eleusis* 95.15–23 of ca. 321/0.

12 *I. Eleusis* 181.22–4.

13 Cf. *IG* II^3 1188.7–8.

14 *IG* II^3 1164.17–20, 24–25, 30–2.

The same Xenocles also dedicated a pair of statues, probably of Demeter and Kore, at Eleusis, with explicit reference to his service as epimeletes of the Mysteries.[15] It is worth repeating that these epimeletai were officials elected by the Ekklesia.

Prosecution of Cases of *Asebeia*

Almost half of all known prosecutions for *asebeia* in Athens concerned the Eleusinian Mysteries. After ca. 415 the Melian poet Diagoras, a notorious atheist, was convicted of "making public" "and denigrating" the Mysteries, and turning away others from them. He was condemned to death and fled the city. By a *psephisma* the Athenians announced rewards for anyone who killed him or returned him to Athens.[16] The profanation of the Mysteries, involving Alcibiades and Andocides, occurred in these same years, and here all the polis machinery was brought to bear. The Ekklesia ordered the Boule to investigate, and the Boule forwarded its findings to the *dikasteria* for trial and punishment. By a *psephisma* the Ekklesia awarded cash rewards for those who offered information on the case, and then ordered the priests and priestesses of Eleusis to curse Alcibiades and, probably, Andocides for their actions.[17] In 201 two uninitiated Acarnanian young men snuck into the sanctuary at Eleusis with the initiants and were discovered. They were arrested and, eventually, put to death—surely through the procedures of the polis, not just of Eleusis. The Acarnanian people turned to Philip V of Macedon for help, and this resulted in the Macedonian assault on Athens and Attica that brought great devastation to the countryside, including probably the destruction of virtually all sanctuaries. The Athenians, in retaliation, abolished the two Macedonian tribes (Demetrias and Antigonis), instituted a *damnatio memoriae* of Philip, his family, and his ancestors, put curses (probably through the Eleusinian priesthood) on all sites that had once served to honor Philip and his ancestors, and called in the Romans.[18]

15 *I. Eleusis* 97 and 98, on which see Clinton, 2005–2008.II.107.

16 On Diagoras and this event, see Rubel, 2014.68–70 with extensive bibliography.

17 On this see now Rubel, 2014.74–98.

18 On this, see Mikalson, 1998.186–94 and Warrior, 1996.

Glossary of Greek Terms

I offer here translations of Greek terms as I present and argue for them in this book.

ἀγαθός, the adjective:
in context of sacrifices, "good," specifically in reference to favorable omens

δίκαιος, the adjective: "just," but more commonly "honest"[1]
δικαιοσύνη, the noun: "justice," but more commonly "honesty"
δικαίως, the adverb: "justly," but more commonly "honestly"

εὐσέβεια, the noun: "proper respect" towards the gods
εὐσεβής, the adjective, and εὐσεβῶς, the adverb: "having proper respect" towards the gods and "in a way showing proper respect"

ἱερόν, the noun: in context of sacrifice "sacrificial victim" and in context of place "sanctuary"

καλός, the adjective, and καλῶς, the adverb: in context of many religious actions, "beautiful" and "beautifully"

ὁσιότης, the noun: "religious correctness"
ὅσιος, the adjective, and ὁσίως, the adverb: "religiously correct" and "religiously correctly"
ὅσιος when contrasted to ἱερός: "not under religious sanctions" or "profane"

πάτριος: "ancestral," "going back to the 'fathers' "
κατὰ τὰ πάτρια (ἔθη): "according to the ancestral customs"

1 On "honest" for δίκαιος and the like in the context of these honorary decrees, though not, of course, in philosophical literature, see Whitehead, 1993.67–8, with whom I strongly agree.

φιλοτιμία, the noun: "love of honor"
φιλότιμος, the adjective, and φιλοτίμως, the adverb: "having a love of honor" and "in a manner showing a love of honor"
φιλοτιμεῖσθαι: "to behave in a manner showing a love of honor"

σωτηρία, the noun, and σωτήριος, the adjective: "safety" and "providing safety"

τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς (ἀνήκοντα): "the things relating to the gods"

ὑγίεια: physical "health"

Glossary of Officials and Terms

These terms are defined for Athens and the classical and Hellenistic periods, as they are used in this book. Somewhat different definitions might suit different places, different contexts, and different time periods. Terms are described for the period of ten tribes and must be adjusted for the periods of eleven or twelve tribes. Most are treated as English words, i.e., they are not italicized. Some I give English plurals (archon: archons); for some, noted below, I maintain their Greek plurals (choregos: choregoi). And I use the Athenian, not English titles for most officials, e.g., strategos for "general" and tamias for "treasurer." More on most of these terms may be conveniently found in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, fourth edition, and a fuller glossary of some of these and of other terms is offered in Hansen, 1987.207–26.

***agon* (*agones*)**: "contest," whether in music, drama, athletic, equestrian or naval events.

agonothetes (agonothetai): an elected official who, from late IV BC on, administered the *agones* of several major *heortai*.

agoronomoi: ten men, selected by lot for annual terms, who maintained order in the marketplace and collected taxes and fines there.[1]

aparchai: offerings of "first fruits" to the gods.[2]

archons: the nine administrative officials of Athens, selected by an allotment process, one from each tribe for a one-year term. One, the eponymous archon, "gave his name" to the year he served, and here is referred to as the archon.

astynomoi: ten men, elected by lot for one-year terms, tasked especially with keeping streets clean and enforcing building regulations.

athlothetes (athlothetai): one of ten members of a board that administered the *pompe* and *agones* and various other elements of the quadrennial Panathenaia.[3]

basileus (basileis): one of the nine archons, selected by lot for one-year term.

boönai: officials, probably annual, who purchased with public funds animals for sacrifice for some *heortai*.[4]

Boule: the Athenian "council" of 500, 50 selected by lot each year from each of the 10 tribes, meeting daily in Athens.[5]

bouleutai: members of the Boule.

---

1 Rhodes, 1993.575–6.

2 Jim, 2014.

3 Shear, 2001.103, 235–6, 279–80, and 456–63, Rhodes, 1993.668–72, and Nagy, 1978.

4 Rosivach, 1994.108–14.

5 Sinclair, 1988 and Rhodes, 1972.

charis: "favor," which gods and humans exchange, of different types and values, each "pleasing to the recipient," in establishing a reciprocal relationship.[6]

choregos (choregoi): wealthy individual selected by archon each year to finance a choral production, including tragedy and comedy, at *heortai* of Dionysus.

demarch: the chief administrative official of each of the 139 demes.

deme: one of the 139 geographical and political units into which the Athenian citizenry was divided.

Demos: the male, adult citizenry of Athens as a group, expressing its will through the Ekklesia.

dokimasia: the public examination of the bouleutai and of some other officials before they assumed office.[7]

drachma: a unit of currency, roughly, for most of the period, the equivalent of a workingman's daily wage.

eisiteteria: offerings made on entering office.[8]

Ekklesia: the "assembly" or "town meeting" of all Athenian citizens who chose to participate, held four times each month, to pass (or reject) by majority vote proposals (*probouleumata*) sent to them by the Boule concerning all aspects of Athenian affairs.[9]

ephebe: young man from age 18 undergoing two years, or later one, of polis-directed training in military, civic, and religious affairs.[10]

epimeletes (epimeletai): "supervisor," holding elected or appointed office as a member of a board. One category of whom in Athens concerns themselves with matters περὶ τοὺς θεούς, distinquished from the priests.[11]

epistates (epistatai): an "overseer," involved primarily in financial matters and care of sacred property.[12]

ergastinae: young women who "wove" Athena's *peplos*.[13]

euthynai: obligatory renderings of financial accounts at end of service by various officials, in the law courts.[14]

---

6 Jim, 2014.60–8.

7 Rhodes, 1993.615–17, 663, and 669.

8 Chaniotis, 2005.45–9, Parker, 2005.98 n. 31, and Bevilacqua, 1996.

9 Sinclair, 1988 and Hansen, 1987.

10 Deshours, 2011.155–77 and Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007.

11 Parker, 2011.49, Garland, 1984.116–17. In private religious associations in Athens, Arnaoutoglou, 2003.108–9.

12 Garland, 1984.117 and Parker, 2011.49. On the epistatai of Eleusis, see Clinton, 2005–2008. II.113 and 1974.11 n. 8 and Cavanaugh, 1996, esp. 1–17.

13 Deshours, 2011.131–6, Aleshire and Lambert, 2003, and Shear, 2001.89 and 99–102.

14 Fröhlich, 2004, esp. 331–362 and Rhodes, 1993.114–15, 316–18, 561–4, and 661.

exegetes (exegetai): "interpreter" of sacred law, both in general and especially for the Eleusinian Mysteries.[15]

***genos* (*gene*)**: an extended family type group, claiming descent in the male line from one ancestor, often a hero or royalty, usually fictitious.[16]

grammateus (grammateis): a secretary, for various organizations.

gymnasiarch: an official associated with the gymnasia, with different responsibilities in different poleis. In Athens for a time financed torch-racing team for his tribe.[17]

***heorte* (*heortai*)**: a recurring religious "festival" including sacrifices, prayers, and, usually, some *agones* (contests). To be distinguished from simple sacrifices or other annual rituals by type and often number of participants.[18]

hierophant: the Eumolpid priest who at the culmination of the Eleusinian Mysteries "showed τὰ ἱερά" and read the "secret words."[19]

hieropoios (hieropoioi): a lay cult administrator, in contrast to priests and others who actually performed religious rituals. Usually one of a board of ten.[20]

hipparch: one of two elected commanders of the cavalry.

kanephoros (kanephoroi): girl who carried a basket in the *pompe* of the Panathenaia and some other *heortai*.[21]

koinon: a private association or group.[22]

kosmetes (kosmetai): an individual, elected for a one-year term, responsible for the training of the ephebes.

kyrbeis: wooden posts or tablets on which were inscribed the *nomoi* of Solon.[23]

nomos* (*nomoi*)**: a law, some going back to the "law making" (nomothesia***) of Draco and Solon, those under the democracy made by a majority vote of the Ekklesia, those after 403 established by a large board of **nomothetai** selected by lot from the juror roles.

orgeones: members, citizens or including citizens, of a *koinon* devoted to the worship of a deity and privately paying for cult activities.[24]

---

15 Deshours, 2011.137.

16 Parker, 1996.56–66 and 284–327.

17 Rhodes, 1993.638–9.

18 Mikalson, 1982.

19 Deshours, 2011.139–40.

20 Rhodes, 2009.1–2, 1972.127–31, and Garland, 1984.117–18. Cf. Whitehead, 1986.180 n. 20, "the word defies translation." For them in demes see Whitehead, 1986.142–3; in phratries, Lambert, 1993.235; and in private religious associations, Arnaoutoglou, 2003.107–8.

21 Connelly, 2007.33–39.

22 Arnaoutoglou, 2003.130–3.

23 Meyer, forthcoming.

24 Wijma, 2014.145–9, Arnaoutoglou, 2003.33–50, Mikalson, 1998.141.

panegyris: "an all-gathering," a term used of such polis *heortai* as the Amphiaraia and the Eleusinian Mysteries.[25]

***pannychis* (*pannychides*)**: an "all night" event, a component of some *heortai*.

phratry: a political/religious group of citizens who considered themselves a "brotherhood" related, however distantly, to one another.[26]

phylarch: one of the elected ten commanders of the ten tribal units of the cavalry.

polemarch: one of the nine archons, selected by lot for one-year term.

***pompe* (*pompai*)**: a procession, a component of several *heortai*.

proedria: preferred seating, usually at *agones*.

prytany: the group of 50 selected by lot from each tribe to serve on the Boule. Each prytany served full time for 1/10 of the year and prepared agenda items for the Boule.

prytanis (-eis): a member of a prytany.

***psephisma* (*psephismata*)**: a decree, proposed by the Boule and accepted by the Ekklesia by majority vote.

stele: a block of marble on which texts were inscribed.

strategos (strategoi): a military general, usually elected for one-year renewable terms, with somewhat different assignments in different periods.

tamias (tamiai): a treasurer.

taxiarch: one of the ten elected commanders of the tribal units of the infantry.

temenos: a parcel of land consecrated to a deity, either as a "sanctuary" or to produce revenue for the cult of the diety.

theoria: an expedition, large or small, to a cult site or *heorte* in a foreign country.

theoroi: participants in a *theoria*.

archethoros: the leader of a *theoria*.

thesmothetes (**thesmothetai**): one of the committee of six archons, selected by lot for a one-year terms.

***thiasos* (*thiasoi*)**: a private group, a *koinon*, made up of non-citizen members and devoted to the worship of a deity.[27]

thiasotai: members of a *thiasos*.

tribe: one of the ten governmental/administrative/military units to which all Athenian citizens were assigned.

trierarch: a wealthy citizen assigned to pay the costs to equip and to command one warship for one year.

---

25 Parker, 1996.77–79.

26 A complex group whose history and structure is difficult to ascertain. See Lambert, 1993.

27 Arnaoutoglou, 2003.60–70, Mikalson, 1998.141.

Bibliography

Ager, S. L. 1996. *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.*, Berkeley.

Aleshire, S. B. 1994. "Towards a Definition of 'State Cult' for Ancient Athens," pp. 9–16 in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm.

———. 1989. *The Athenian Asklepieion*, Amsterdam.

Aleshire, S. B. and Lambert, S. D. 2003. "Making the *Peplos* for Athena: A New Edition of *IG* II² 1060 + *IG* II² 1036," *ZPE* 142.65–86.

Anderson, R. 2015. "New Gods," pp. 309–23 in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Religion*, eds. E. Eidenow and J. Kindt, Oxford.

Arnaoutoglou, I. 2003. *Thusias heneka kai sunousias: Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*, Athens.

———. 1994. "The Date of *IG* II² 1273," *ZPE* 104.107–10.

Audollent, A. 1904. *Defixionum Tabellae*, Paris.

Behrend, D. 1970. *Attische Pachturkunden, Vestigia* 12, Munich.

Bevilacqua, G. 1996. "Exitetèria per Afrodite Hegemone da Ramnunte," *Miscellanea Graeca e Romana* 20.55–66.

Blok, J. H. 2011. "*Hosiê and Athenian Law from Solon to Lykourgos*," pp. 233–54 in *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes: autour du politique dans la cité classique*, eds. V. Azoulay and P. Ismard, Paris.

Blok, J. H. and Lambert, S. 2009. "The Appointment of Priests in Attic Gene," *ZPE* 169.95–121.

Bonnechere, P. 2013. "The Religious Management of the *Polis*: Oracles and Political Decision-Making," pp. 366–81 in *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, ed. H. Beck, Oxford.

Bowden, H. 2005. *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle*, Cambridge.

Bremmer, J. N. 1994. *Greek Religion*, Oxford.

Bugh, G. R. 1990. "The Theseia in Late Hellenistic Athens," *ZPE* 83.20–37.

———. 1988. *The Horsemen of Athens*, Princeton.

Burkert, W. 1996. "Greek Temple-Builders: Who, Where, and Why?", pp. 21–9 in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm.

Buxton, R. 2000. *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, Oxford.

Canevaro, M. 2013. "*Nomothesia* in Classical Athens: What Sources Should We Believe?", *CQ* 63.139–160.

———. 2013a. *The Documents in the Attic Orators*, Oxford.

Canevaro, M. and Harris, E. M. 2012. "The Documents in Andocides' *On the Mysteries*," *CQ* 62.98–129.

Carawan, E. 2010. "The Case against Nikomachos," *TAPA* 140.71–95.

Carlier, P. 1984. *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg.

Cavanaugh, M. B. 1996. *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Atlanta.

Chaniotis, A. 2013. "Processions in Hellenistic Cities. Contemporary Discourses and Ritual Dynamics," pp. 21–47 in *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City After the Classical Age*, eds. R. Alston, O. M. van Nijf, and C. G. Williamson, Leuven.

———. 2011. "The Ithyphallic Hymn for Demetrios Poliorketes and Hellenistic Religious Morality," pp. 157–95 in *More Than Men, Less Than Gods*, eds. P. Iossif, A. S. Chankowski, and C. C. Lorber, Leuven.

———. 2009. "The Dynamics of Ritual Norms in Greek Cult," pp. 91–105 in *La norme en matière religieuse en Grèce ancienne*, ed. P. Brulé, Liège.

———. 2005. "Griechische Rituale der Statusänderung und ihre Dynamik," pp. 44–61 in *Investitur- und Krönungsrituale*, eds. M. Steinicke and S. Weinfurter, Cologne—Weimar.

———. 1995. "Sich selbst feiern? Städtische Feste des Hellenismus in Spannungsfeld von Religion und Politik," pp. 147–72 in *Stadtbilder und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, eds. M. Wörrle and P. Zanker, Munich.

Chiron, P. 2007. "The *Rhetoric to Alexander*," pp. 90–106 in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. I. Worthingon, Oxford.

Clinton, K. 2010. "The Eleusinian *Aparche* in Practice: 329/8 B.C.," in *Ιερα και λατρειες της Δημητρας στον αρχαιο ελληνικο κοσμο*, eds. I. Leventi and C. Mitsopoulou, Volos.

———. 2005–2008. *Eleusis: The Inscriptions on Stone*, 3 vols., Athens = *IE*.

———. 1994. "The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asclepius in Athens," pp. 17–34 in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm.

———. 1982. "The Nature of the Late Fifth-Century Revision of the Athenian Law Code," *Hesp. Suppl.* 19.27–37.

———. 1980. "A Law in the City Eleusinion Concerning the Mysteries," *Hesp.* 49.258–88.

———. 1974. *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Philadelphia.

Connelly, J. B. 2007. *Portrait of a Priestess*, Princeton.

Connor, W. R. 1987. "'Sacred' and 'Secular:' Ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια and the Classical Athenian Concept of the State," *Ancient Society* 19.161–88.

Cook, B. L. 2009. "Athenian Terms of Civic Praise in the 330s: Aeschines vs. Demosthenes," *GRBS* 49.31–52.

Csapo, E. and Wilson, P. 2010. "Le passage de la chorégie à l'agonothésie à Athènes à la fin du IV^{e} siècle," pp. 83–105 in *L'argent dans les concours du monde grec*, ed. B. Le Guen, Saint-Denis.

Davies, J. K. 1988. "Religion and the State," pp. 368–88 in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, second edition, vol. IV, Cambridge.

———. 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*, New York.

Deshours, N. 2011. *L'été indien de la religion civique*, Paris.
Diggle, J. 2004. *Theophrastus: Characters*, Cambridge.
Dihle, A. 1968. *Der Kanon der zwei Tugenden*, Cologne.
Dontas, G. S. 1983. "The True Aglaurion," *Hesp*. 52.48–63.
Dover, K. J. 1994. *Marginal Comment: A Memoir*, London.
———. 1974. *Greek Popular Morality*, Berkeley.
Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes: Birds*, Oxford.
Edwards, M. J. 1999. *Lysias: Five Speeches*, London.
Eide, T. 1984. "ΜΕΡΙΣΑΙ and ΔΟΥΝΑΙ in Athenian Fourth-Century Decrees," *Symbolae Osloenses* 59.21–28.
Eidenow, E. 2007. *Oracles, Curses, and Risk among the Ancient Greeks*, Oxford.
Engen, D. 1999. "*IG* II² 204 and On Organization (Dem. ? 13): The Dispute over the Sacred *Orgas* of Eleusis and the Chronology of Philip II of Macedon," pp. 135–52 in *Text and Tradition*, eds. R. Mellor and L. Tritle, Claremont.
Faraone, C. A. 2011. "Curses, Crime Detection and Conflict Resolution at the Festival of Demeter Thesmophoros," *JHS* 131.25–44.
Fisher, N. 2001. *Aeschines: Against Timarchus*, Oxford.
Flower, M. A. 2015. "Religious Expertise," pp. 293–307 in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Religion*, eds. E. Eidenow and J. Kindt, Oxford.
Fontenrose, J. 1978. *The Delphic Oracle*, Berkeley.
Fornara, C. W. and Yates, D. C. 2007. "*FGrHist* 328 (Philochorus) F 181," *GRBS* 47.31–37.
Frisch, H. 1942. *The Constitution of the Athenians*, Copenhagen.
Fröhlich, P. 2004. *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats*, Geneva.
Frost, F. 2002. "Solon *Pornoboskos* and Aphrodite Pandemos," *Syllecta Classica* 13.34–46.
Gager, J. G. 1992. *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, Oxford.
Garland, R. 1992. *Introducing New Gods*, Ithaca.
———. 1990. "Priests and Power in Classical Athens," pp. 73–91 in *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, eds. M. Beard and J. North, London.
———. 1984. "Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens," *ABSA* 79.75–123.
Gauthier, P. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Athens.
Gauthier, P. and Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia*, Athens.
Georgoudi, S. 2007. "Les magistrats au service des dieux: le cas des démarques en Attique," pp. 83–109 in *Athènes et le politique*, eds. P. Schmitt-Pantel and F. de Polignac, Paris.
Goette, H. R. 2000. *Ὁ ἀξιόλογος δῆμος Σούνιον, Landeskundliche Studien in Südost-Attika*, Rahden/Westf.
Graf, F. 1995. "Bemerkungen zur bürgerlichen Religiosität im Zeitalter des Hellenismus," 103–14 in *Stadtbilder und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, eds. M. Wörrle and P. Zanker, Munich.

———. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte*, Rome.

Gschnitzer, F. 1989. "Bemerkungen zum Zusammenwirken von Magistraten und Priestern in der griechischen Welt," *Ktema* 14.31–8.

Habicht, C. 2006. "Versäumpter Götterdienst," *Historia* 55.153–66.

———. 1995. "Ist ein 'Honoratiorenregime' das Kennzeichen der Stadt im späteren Hellenismus?", pp. 87–92 in *Stadtbilder und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, eds. M. Wörrle and P. Zanker, Munich.

———. 1992. "Athens and the Ptolemies," *Classical Antiquity* 11.68–90.

———. 1961. "Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege," *Hermes* 89.1–35.

———. 1961a. "Neue Inschriften aus dem Kerameikos," *AM* 76.127–41.

Hakkarainen, M. 1997. "Private Wealth in the Athenian Public Sphere during the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Period," pp. 1–32 in *Early Hellenistic Athens: Symptoms of Change*, ed. J. Frösén, Helsinki.

Hansen, M. H. 1982. "Seven Hundred *Archai* in Classical Athens," *GRBS* 21.151–73.

———. 1987. *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes*, Oxford.

Harris, D. 1995. *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*, Oxford.

Harris, E. M. 2013. *The Rule of Law in Action in Democratic Athens*, Oxford.

———. 2013a. "The Against Meidias (Dem. 21)," pp. 209–36 in *The Documents in the Attic Orators*, M. Canevaro, Oxford.

———. 2012. "Sophocles and Athenian Law," pp. 287–300 in *A Companion to Sophocles*, ed. K. Ormand, Oxford.

———. 2008. *Demosthenes, Speeches 20–22*, Austin.

———. 1989. "Demosthenes' Speech against Meidias," *HSCP* 92.117–36.

Harrison, A. R. W. 1971. *The Law of Athens*, vol. 2, Oxford.

Headlam. W. and Knox, A. D. 1922. *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge.

Hedrick, C. W. 1988. "The Temple and Cult of Apollo Patroos in Athens," *AJA* 92.185–210.

Henry, A. S. 1996. "The Hortatory Intention in Athenian State Decrees," *ZPE* 112.105–19.

———. 1983. *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees*, Hildesheim.

———. 1980. "Epigraphica Attica," *ZPE* 38.91–94.

Hornblower, S. 1991–2008. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford.

Horster, M. 2012. "The Tenure, Appointment and Eponymy of Priesthoods and their (Debatable) Ideological and Political Implications," pp. 161–208 in *Civic Priests: Cult Personnel in Athens from the Hellenistic Period to Late Antiquity*, eds. M. Horster and A. Klöckner, Berlin.

———. 2010. "Lysimache and the Others: Some Notes on the Position of Women in Athenian Religion," pp. 177–92 in *Studies in Greek Epigraphy and History in Honor of Stephen V. Tracy*, eds. G. Reger, F. X. Ryan, and T. F. Winters, Paris.

Hubbe, R. O. 1959. "Decrees from the Precinct of Asklepios at Athens," *Hesp*. 28.169–201.

Hughes, D. D. 1999. "Hero Cult, Heroic Honors, Heroic Dead: Some Developments in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," pp. 167–75 in *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm.

Humphreys, S. C. 2004. *The Strangeness of Gods*, Oxford.

Jameson, M. 1980. "Apollo Lykeios in Athens," *Archaiognosia* 1.213–36.

Jim, T. S. F. 2014. *Sharing with the Gods*, Oxford.

Jones, N. F. 2004. *Rural Athens under the Democracy*, Philadelphia.

———. 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens*, Oxford.

Kahrstedt, U. 1936. *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen*, Stuttgart.

Karila-Cohen, K. 2010. "L'étude du sentiment religieux à partir du lexique: l'exemple de ἐνθύμιος et ἐθυμιστός, pp. 109–21 in *Paysage et religion en Grèce antique*, eds. P. Carlier and C. Lerouge-Cohen, Paris.

Kavoulaki, A. 1999. "Processional Performance and the Democratic Polis," pp. 293–320 in *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, eds. S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, Cambridge.

Kearns, E. 1990. "Saving the City," pp. 323–44 in *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, eds. O. Murray and S. Price, Oxford.

———. 1989. *The Heroes of Attica, BICS Suppl*. 57, London.

Keesling, C. M. 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*, Cambridge.

Kindt, J. 2012. *Rethinking Greek Religion*, Oxford.

Konstan, D. 2014. *Beauty*, Oxford.

Kremmydas, C. 2012. *Commentary on Demosthenes Against Leptines*, Oxford.

Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise*, Ithaca.

Lambert, S. D. 2012. "The Social Construction of Priests and Priestesses in Athenian Honorific Decrees from the Fourth Century B.C. to the Augustan Period," pp. 67–133 in *Civic Priests: Cult Personnel in Athens from the Hellenistic Period to Late Antiquity*, eds. M. Horster and A. Klöckner, Berlin.

———. 2012a. *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1-332/1 B.C.*, Leiden.

———. 2011. "What was the Point of Inscribed Honorific Decrees in Classical Athens?" pp. 193–214 in *Sociable Man*, ed. S. D. Lambert, Swansea.

———. 2010. "A Polis and its Priests: Athenian Priesthoods before and after Pericles' Citizenship Law," *Historia* 59.143–75.

———. 2002. "The Sacrificial Calendar of Athens," *ABSA* 97.353–99.

———. 2002a. "Parerga III: The Genesia, Basile, and Epops Again," *ZPE* 139.75–82.

———. 2000. "The Greek Inscriptions on Stone in the British School at Athens," *ABSA* 95.485–515.

———. 2000a. "The Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: A Revised Text," *ZPE* 130.43–70.

———. 1997. "The Attic Genos Salaminioi and the Island of Salamis," *ZPE* 119.85–106.
———. 1993. *The Phratries of Attica*, Ann Arbor.
Lamont, J. 2015. "Asklepios in the Piraeus and the Mechanisms of Cult Appropriation," pp. 37–50 in *Autopsy in Athens*, ed. M. M. Miles, Oxford.
Lasagni, C. 2004. "I decreti onorifici dei demi attici e la prassi politica delle realtà locali," pp. 91–128 in *La prassi della democrazia ad Atene*, ed. E. C. Gastaldi, Alessandria.
Lewis, D. M. 1985. "The Archonship of Lysiades," *ZPE* 58.271–74.
———. 1979. "An Inventory in the Agora," *ZPE* 36.131–4.
———. 1954. "Notes on Attic Inscriptions," *ABSA* 49.17–50.
Lewis, N. 1965. "*Leitourgia* and Related Terms (II)," *GRBS* 6.227–30.
———. 1960. "*Leitourgia* and Related Terms," *GRBS* 3.175–84.
Linders, T. 1987. "Gods, Gifts, Society," pp. 115–22 in *Gifts to the Gods*, eds. T. Linders and G. Nordquist, Uppsala.
Lippman, M., Scahill, D., and Schultz, P. 2006. "*Knights* 843–59, the Nike Temple Bastion, and Cleon's Shields from Pylos," *AJA* 110.551–63.
Lupu, E. 2005. *Greek Sacred Law*, Leiden.
Luraghi, N. 2010. "The Demos as Narrator: Public Honours and the Construction of Future and Past," pp. 247–63 in *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, eds. L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, Stuttgart.
Makres, A. 2003. "The *Sophronistai* of Aixone (*IG* II^2 1199)," pp. 79–84 in *Lettered Attica: A Day of Attic Epigraphy*, eds. D. Jordan and J. Trail, Toronto.
Mark, I. S. 1993. *The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens, Hesp. Suppl.* 26, Princeton.
Mattingly, H. 1997. "The Date and Purpose of the Pseudo-Xenophon Constitution of Athens," *CQ* 47.352–7.
MacDowell, D. M. 1990. *Demothenes: Against Meidias*, Oxford.
McLean, B. H. 2002. *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C.–A.D. 337)*, Ann Arbor.
Meyer, E. A. 2013. "Inscriptions as Honors and the Athenian Epigraphic Habit," *Historia* 62.453–505.
Migeotte, L. 1992. *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités Grecques*, Québec.
Mikalson, J. D. 2010a. *Ancient Greek Religion*, second edition, Oxford.
———. 2010. *Greek Popular Religion in Greek Philosophy*, Oxford.
———. 2007. "Gods and Athletic Games," pp. 33–40 in *The Panathenaic Games*, eds. O. Palagia and A. Choremi-Spetsieri, Oxford.
———. 2003. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*, Chapel Hill.
———. 1998. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, Berkeley.
———. 1983. *Athenian Popular Religion*, Chapel Hill.

———. 1982. "The *Heorte* of Heortology," *GRBS* 23.213–21.
———. 1977. "Religion in the Attic Demes," *AJP* 98.424–35.
———. 1975. *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*, Princeton.
———. 1972. "*Prothyma*," *AJP* 93.577–83.
Miles, M. M. 1998. *The City Eleusinion, The Athenian Agora*, vol. 31, Princeton.
Mirhady, D. C. 2011. *Aristotle: Rhetoric to Alexander*, Loeb vol. 16, Cambridge, MA.
Monaco, M. C. 2001. "Contributi allo studio di alcuni santuari Ateniesi I: Il *temenos* del *Demos* e delle *Charites, Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene* 79.103–50.
Nagy, B. 1978. "The Athenian Athlothetai," *GRBS* 19.307–13.
Naiden, F. 2015. "Sacrifice," pp. 463–75 in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Religion*, eds. E. Eidenow and J. Kindt, Oxford.
———. 2013. *Smoke Signals for the Gods*, Oxford.
Nelson, M. 2006. "The Phantom Stelai of Lysias, *Against Nicomachus* 17," *CQ* 56.309–12.
Newton, C. T. 1863. *A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus and Branchidae*, vol. 2, London.
Ober, J. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*, Princeton.
Osborne, M. J. 2009. "The Archons of Athens 300/299–228/7," *ZPE* 171.83–99.
———. 2000. "Philinos and the Athenian Archons of the 250s B.C.," pp. 507–20 in *Polis & Politics*, eds. P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein, Copenhagen.
———. 1981. "Entertainment in the Prytaneion at Athens," *ZPE* 41.153–70.
Osborne, R. 2004. *The Old Oligarch*, second edition, London.
———. 1999. "Inscribing Performance," pp. 341–58 in *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, eds. S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, Cambridge.
Parke, H. W. 1967. *The Oracles of Zeus*, Cambridge, MA.
Parke, H. W. and Wormell, D. E. W. 1956 .*The Delphic Oracle*, Oxford.
Parker, R. 2011. *On Greek Religion*, Ithaca.
———. 2010. "New Problems in Athenian Religion: The 'Sacred Law' from Aixone," pp. 193–208 in *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity*, eds. J. Dijkstra, J. Kroesen, and Y. Kuiper, Leiden.
———. 2008. "πατρῷοι θεοί: The Cults of Sub-Groups and Identity in the Greek World," pp. 201–14 in *Religion and Society*, eds. A. H. Rasmussen and S. W. Rasmussen, Rome.
———. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford.
———. 2005a. "Law and Religion," pp. 61–81 in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*, eds. M. Gagarin and D. Cohen, Cambridge.
———. 2004. "What are Sacred Laws?", pp. 57–70 in *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece*, eds. E. M. Harris and L. Rubinstein, London.
———. 1998. "Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion," pp. 105–25 in *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, eds. C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite, and R. Seaford, Oxford.

———. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford.

———. 1985. "Greek States and Greek Oracles," pp. 298–326 in *Crux: Essays Presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix*, eds. P. A. Cartledge and F. D. Harvey, Exeter.

———. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford.

Patera, I. 2011. "Changes and Arrangements in a Traditional Cult: The Case of the Eleusinian Rituals," pp. 119–37 in *Ritual Dynamics in the Ancient Mediterranean: Agency, Emotion, Gender, Representation*, ed. A. Chaniotis, Stuttgart.

Pébarthe, C. 2006. *Cité, démocratie, et écriture*, Paris.

Pecírka, J. 1966. *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*, Prague.

Perrin-Saminadayar, E. 2012. "Prêtres et prêtesses d' Athènes et de Délos à travers les décrets honorifiques athéniens (167–88 a. C.)," pp. 135–59 in *Civic Priests: Cult Personnel in Athens from the Hellenistic Period to Late Antiquity*, eds. M. Horster and A. Klöckner, Berlin.

———. 2007. *Éducation, culture et société à Athènes*, Paris.

Petrovic, A. 2015. " 'Sacred Law,' " pp. 338–52 in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Religion*, eds. E. Eidenow and J. Kindt, Oxford.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1988. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, second edition, Oxford.

Pirenne-Delforge, V. 1994. *L'Aphrodite grecque*, Athens-Liège.

Pritchard, D. M. 2015. *Public Spending and Democracy in Classical Athens*, Austin.

Pritchett, W. K. 1979. *The Greek State at War*, Part III, Berkeley.

———. 1971. *Ancient Greek Military Practices*, Part I, Berkeley.

Rauchenstein, R. 1872. *Ausgewählte Reden des Lysias*, Berlin.

Rhodes, P. J. 2009. "State and Religion in Athenian Inscriptions," *Greece & Rome* 56.1–13.

———. 2006. "The Reforms and Laws of Solon: An Optimistic View," pp. 248–60 in *Solon of Athens*, eds. J. H. Blok and A. P. M. H. Lardinois, Leiden.

———. 1993. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, second edition with addenda, Oxford.

———. 1991. "The Athenian Code of Laws, 410–399 B.C.," *JHS* 111.87–100.

———. 1987. "*Nomothesia* in Classical Athens," pp. 5–26 in *L' Educazione giuridica* 5.2.

———. 1972. *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford (reprinted with addenda and corrigenda in 1985).

Robert, L. 1960. "Décret de Samos," *Hellenica* 11–12.126–31.

Robertson, N. 1990. "The Laws of Athens, 410–399 B.C.: The Evidence for Review and Publication," *JHS* 110.43–75.

Rosenzweig, R. 2004. *Worshipping Aphrodite*, Ann Arbor.

Rosivach, V. J. 1994. *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens*, Atlanta.

Rotroff, S. I. 1978. "An Anonymous Hero in the Athenian Agora," *Hesp*. 47.196–209.

Rubel, A. 2014. *Fear and Loathing in Ancient Athens*, Durham.

Rupprecht, A. 1927. "Die demosthenische Prooemiensammlung," *Philologus* 82.365–433.

Ruschenbusch, E. 1966. *ΣΩΛΟΝΟΣ NOMOI*, Wiesbaden.

Rutherford, I. 2013. *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.

Sandys, J. E. 1912. *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*, second edition, London.

Scafuro, A. C. 2009. "The Crowning of Amphiaraus," pp. 59–86 in *Greek History and Epigraphy*, eds. L. Mitchell and L. Rubenstein, Swansea.

———. 2006. "Identifying Solonian Laws," pp. 175–96 in *Solon of Athens*, eds. J. H. Blok and A. P. M. H. Lardinois, Leiden.

Scheer, T. S. 2015. "Art and Imagery," pp. 165–78 in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion*, eds. E. Eidenow and J. Kindt, Oxford.

Schwenk, C. J. 1985. *Athens in the Age of Alexander*, Chicago.

Shapiro, H. A. 1996. "Cults of Solonian Athens," pp. 127–33 in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm.

———. 1986. "The Attic Deity Basile," *ZPE* 63.134–6.

Shear, J. L. 2011. *Polis and Revolution*, Cambridge.

———. 2001. *Polis and Panathenaia: The History and Development of Athena's Festival*, Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Simms, R. R. 1988. "The Cult of the Thracian Goddess Bendis in Athens and Attica," *Ancient World* 18.59–76.

Sinclair, R. K. 1988. *Democracy and Participation in Athens*, Cambridge.

Sommerstein, A. H. 1987. *Aristophanes: Birds*, Warminster.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1990. "What is Polis Religion?" pp. 295–322 in *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, eds. O. Murray and S. Price, Oxford.

———. 1988. "Further Aspects of Polis Religion," *Annali dell' Instituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Sezione di Archeologia e Storia Antica* 10.259–74.

Stavrianopoulou, E. 2011. " 'Promises of Continuity': The Role of Tradition in the Forming of Rituals in Ancient Greece," pp. 85–103 in *Ritual Dynamics in the Ancient Mediterranean: Agency, Emotion, Gender, Representation*, ed. A. Chaniotis, Stuttgart.

Strassler, R. B. 2009. ed., *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika*, New York.

———. 2007. *The Landmark Herodotus*, New York.

———. 1996. *The Landmark Thucydides*, New York.

Stroud, R. S. 1998. *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/373 B.C.*, Princeton.

Taylor, C. 2015. "Epigraphic Evidence," pp. 97–111 in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Religion*, eds. E. Eidenow and J. Kindt, Oxford.

Taylor, M. C. 1997. *Salamis and the Salaminioi*, Amsterdam.

Todd, S. C. 2000. *Lysias*, Austin.

———. 1996. "Lysias against Nikomachos: The Fate of the Expert in Athenian Law," pp. 101–31 in *Greek Law in its Political Setting*, eds. L. Foxhall and A. D. E. Lewis, Oxford.

Tracy, S. 1995. *Athenian Democracy in Transition: Attic Letter-Cutters of 340–290 B.C.*, Berkeley.

———. 1990. *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, Berkeley.

———. 1982. *I.G. II² 2336: Contributors of First Fruits for the Pythaïs*, Meisenheim am Glan.

Trampedach, K. 2015. *Politische Mantik*, Heidelberg.

Van Straten, F. T. 1995. *Hiera Kala*, Leiden.

Veligianni-Terzi, C. 1997. *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der Klassischen Zeit*, Stuttgart.

Versnel, H. S. 2011. *Coping with the Gods*, Leiden.

———. 1991. "Beyond Cursing: The Appeal to Justice in Judicial Prayers," pp. 60–106 in *Magika Hiera*, eds. C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink, Oxford.

von Reden, S. 1995. *Exchange in Ancient Greece*, London.

von Wilamowitz, U. 1893. *Aristotles und Athen*, 2 vols., Berlin.

Warrior, V. M. 1996. *The Initiation of the Second Macedonian War*, Stuttgart.

West, W. C. 1995. "The Decrees of Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*," *ZPE* 107.237–47.

Whitehead, D. 2000. *Hypereides*, Oxford.

———. 1993. "Cardinal Virtues: The Language of Public Approbation in Democratic Athens," *Classica et Medievalia* 44.37–75.

———. 1986. *The Demes of Attica*, Princeton.

———. 1983. "Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: φιλοτιμία in Democratic Athens," *Classica et Medievalia* 34.55–74.

Wickkiser, B. L. 2008. *Asklepios, Medicine, and the Politics of Healing in Fifth-Century Greece*, Baltimore.

Wijma, S. M. 2014. *Embracing the Immigrant: The Participation of Metics in Athenian Polis Religion* (*5th–4th Century B.C.*), Stuttgart.

Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge.

Wohl, V. 1996. "εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας: Hegemony and Democracy at the Panathenaia," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 47.25–88.

Worthington, I. 2004. "Oral Performance in the Athenian Assembly and the Demosthenic *Prooemia*," pp. 129–43 in *Oral Performance and its Context*, ed. C. J. Mackie, Leiden.

———. 1992. *A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus*, Ann Arbor.

Wyse, W. 1904. *The Speeches of Isaeus*, Hildesheim (reprinted 1967).

Yunis, H. 1996. *Taming Democracy: Models of Political Rhetoric in Classical Athens*, Ithaca.

Zaccarini, M. 2015. "The Return of Theseus to Athens: A Case Study in Layered Tradition and Reception," *Histos* 9.174–98.

Index of Inscriptions Cited

Agora 15

1–56	208
1	208
6	208
13	208
34	63
35	208
38	65, 74
45	24, 63, 205
69	244
70	64
71	85–86
76	85, 113
78	21, 42–43, 64, 82, 85–86, 88–89, 113, 137–138, 249, 274
81	25, 64–65, 113, 252
85	63, 65, 82, 99, 206, 249
86	24, 43, 65
89	20–21, 63, 65, 86, 113
115	21–22, 64–65, 82, 86, 88–89, 249
180	64–65, 277
183	64, 114
184	114
219	86
238	21, 86
240	21, 48, 64, 82, 86, 113–114, 170, 249
243	86
246	86
253	19, 26
260	64
261	86
285	38

Agora 16

7	127, 281
41	196
48	84
56	84
67	119
77	20, 35
80	244
114	64, *136*, 141–142, 197
123	68, 222, 262
161	153
181	27, 58, 112–113, 130, 217
182	68, 85, 222
185	66, 68, 98, 220, 222, 245
186	21, 57, 68, 209, 212, 249
187	44, 66, 98, 220, 222, 245
214	22, 57
218	32
227	50
235	30, 83, 251
270	19, 69, 131, 222
271	30
277	19, 52, 57, 82, 101, 228
324	153, 295
325	51, 55, 295

Agora 18

35	217
39	218
40	219
79	211
80	208
148	221
152	222
162	221
168	221
169–70	221
242	206

Aleshire, *Inv.*

IV, V, VII	140
IX	52, 140

CID

1.11	286
4.110	289, 295

FD

2.1.362	287
3.1.152	289–290, 295
3.1.362	286–287
3.1.482	294
3.1.511	211, 216
3.2.3	211, 216

FD (cont.)
3.2.27 15, 157, 194
3.2.33 289, 295
3.2.47 234
3.2.48 38, 40, 157, 259
3.2.49 38, 40
3.2.50 38, 157, 283–284
3.2.89 47
3.2.92 289–290
3.2.94 294
3.3.118 47
3.3.147 47
3.3.240 240
3.3.242 295
3.3.249 290
3.3.383 294
3.4.49 295
3.4.52 295
3.4.56 47
3.4.57 47
3.4.77 295
3.4.133–134 287
3.4.161 47
3.4.171 47
3.4.431 295
3.6.4 47

Hesperia Supplement 15
#1 *31*, 42, 82, 101
#2 *31*, 101, 139
#3 15, 48, 55, 251
#6 23–24, 58, 72, 75–76, 82, 84, 96, 130, 226, 256, 281, 284
#16 32, 47, 99, 260

I. Beroia
1 284, *287*

I. Cos
ED 146 295
EF 77 294
EF 756 284

I. Délos
68 284
1518 290
1520 295

I. Didyma
142 38

I. Eleusis
13 74, *128*, 297
19 134, 297
28a 84, 113, 127–129, 159–160, 169, 209, 218, 297
30 *128*, 297
39 224
41 94, 128, 297
45 209
70 25, 44, 70, 100, *101*, 244, 257
72 51, 54, 245
85 53, 137, 255
93 32–33, 249, 260
94 221
95 33, 94, 277, 299
97–98 94, 300
100 59, 298
101 101
135 297
138 59, 111, 133, 160, 169, 296, 298–299
142 62, 133–134, 205, 297–298
175 297
177 67, 72, 136, 199, 205, 298
181 24, 43, 72, 85, 87–88, 94, 249, 298–299
184 110
186 198
188 297
192 71, 82, 114, 169, 299
194 68
196 68, 84–85, 98, 114, 221
199 297
206 297
211 68
229 29, 61, 85, 87–88, 101, 112, 114, 298
233 138, 297
234 44, 51, 246
236 51, 54
237 297
250 138, 169, 297–299
286 198

IG I^3

7 115, 119, 125, 155, 170
8 144
14 127
21 118
34 127
35 12, 124, *125*, 128, 198
36 125, 198
40 63, 156, 177, 220
49 118
52 53, 285
64 *128*, 205, 260
71 127
82 23–24, 27, 74, 127–128, 209–210, 257
84 *30*, 39, 121, 128, 135, 218
92A 204
130 125, 260
131 119
136 12, 26, 125, 152, 156, 179, 257
137 158, 205
138 33, 52, *127*, 228, 260
244 *137*, 236
253–4 61
255 12
256 156
258 *236*
501 195
993 261
1015 261

IG II^2

47 52, 59, 65, 72, 136, *202*, 207, 216
97 84
114 196
116 119
120 34, 39, 84
380 28, 60
457 261
649 252
653 84
657 70, *95*, 110, 214–215, 233, 238–239, 245
659 60, 113, 138
667 245
668 19, 43, 58, 82, 85, 87–88, 135, 217, 249
676 24, 43, 71, 212, 249, 262
677 22, 32, 249
680 28, 138, 294
682 29, 70, 111, 214–215, 238, 245, 257–258
685 68
690 20, 43, 50, 54, 93, 249, 252
713 24, 29
772 115, 136
776 30, 43–44, 47, 50, 53–55, 57, 85, 87, 93, 109–110, 112, 135, 140, 170, 246–247, 251, 262
780 19, 22, 29, 43, 47, 69–70, 85, 87, 110, 113–114, 171, 214–215, 238–239, 242–243, 249
781 58, 85, 217
783 71, 85, 209, 212, 256
784 70, 127, 213–215, 242
788 21, 43, 50, 53–54, 57, 93, 200, 246, 249
793 286
840 34, 53, *140*, 204, 220, 239, 262
841–2 140
908 84
930 75
956 22, *27*, 29, 47, 70, *96*, 111, 113, 138, 169, 216, 233, 238–239, 245
957 *27*, 29, 64, 70, *96*, 111, 138, 169, 215–216, 233, 238, 257
958 22, *27*, 29, 47, *96*, 111, 138, 215–216, 233, 238–239
968 95, 216, 233, 238
976 51, 114, 262
994 295
1000 86–87
1008 22–23, 48, 59, 66, 71–72, 75–76, 84, 87, 217, 220, 256, 262
1011 22, 75–76, 82, 84–85, 88, 96, 114, 130, 171, 225–226, 262
1029 23–24, 48, 58, 72, 75–76, 84, 130, 226, 256, 281
1030 23, 75, 97, 130, 226, 281

IG II² (cont.)
1034 *26*, 143
1043 29, 48, 92
1045 44
1054 47, 84–85, 87
1072 205, 298
1096 177
1134 119, 153
1138 28
1152 244
1163 21, 43, 45–46, 51–52, 54, 57, 82, 131, 135, 140, 249
1166 249
1177 113, 139, 151
1178 25, 61
1188 43
1199 26, 50, 54, 74, 213
1200 28, 100
1204 21
1214 119, 137, 245
1215 84, *100*, 286
1235 48, 246, 261
1245 131, 262
1247 21, 24, 27, 50, 53, 112, 172, 244
1252 244, 247
1259 24, 247
1261 114, 116, 247
1262 24, 247
1265 102, 294
1271 32, 48, 55, 102, 153, 245, 247
1273 31, 52–53, 247
1275 39
1277 32–33, 102, 116, 119, 153, 247, 261
1278 45, 152, 247
1282 31, 48, 263
1283 20, *116*, 152, 156, *179*
1284 152, 247
1289 116, 202
1290 83
1291 153
1292 22, 42, 246–247
1293 146
1297 86, 102, 247
1298 153
1302 98, 221
1314 51, 54–55, 245, 247, 251
1315 30, 47, 51–55, 83, 247, 251
1316 51–52, 55, 101, 251
1320 102, 249
1324 27, 48, 102, 246–247
1325 116
1326 102, 116, 152
1327 21, 83, 102, 235, 246
1328 30
1329 102, 246
1330 245
1334 245, 247, 262
1337 51, 86, 114, 247, 251
1361 151–*152*
1362 52, 139
1425 196
1428 205
1437 205
1443 196, 206
1445–54 192
1474 206
1485 214
1486 214
1494 206
1496 *66*–67, 70, 72, 74, 165–166, 188, 206–207, 210–211, 220
1544 206, 298
1749 209
1933 53, 161, 262
1934 53, 262
1935 161
1937 74
1938 74
2330 99
2334 99
2338 38
2790–2 206
2795 196
2795a 196
2797–8 206
2801 206
2832 211
2836–7 219
2843 219
2855 219
2857 221
2859 211

2866 221
2872–3 221
2932 74
3073 232
3096 70
3394 38
3454 198
3464 260
3479 217
3484–5 55
4596 261
4636 143
4949 162
4962 52, *202*
6557 38
7227 38
7863 38
8870 38
8593 283
13092 284

IG II^3
35 199
227 84
244 61
292 *30–31*, 39, 45, 138, 162, 177
298 84, 213
306 25, 63, 205, 244, 263
316 84
327 122
337 *143*, 179, 194
348 25, 131, 255, 257
349 49
352 98
355 25, 27–28, 71, 132, 209, 212, 244
359 33, 51, 55, 57, 85–86, 131, 135, 137, 140, 200, 244, 262
360 206
369 74–75, 192, 213
375 96
383 192
416 50, 54, 57, *73*, 85, 87–88, 92, 200, 209, 213, 244
429 134
444 *139*, 204
445 134, 161, 261
447 25–26, 70, 73, *132*, 135, 137, 207, 209–210, 216, 220, 222, 237, 255–257, 260
448 *143*–144
449 *143*–144
473 28
1139 21, 86, 249
1144 65
1147 84
1149 86
1150 44
1153 65, 82
1154 34, 53, 139–*140*, 204, 220, 239, 262
1155 86, 249
1160 *95*, 215
1162 21, 86, 88
1164 43, *71*, 84, 94, 114, 169, 213, 246, 249, 298–299
1165 43, 86, 89, 249
1166 23, 29, 44, 48, 130, 249
1168 65, 82
1176 23, 29, 48, 113, 169–170, 225–226, 257
1188 24, 43, 71, 85, 87–88, 94, 114, 299
1189 43, 50, 54
1231 65
1239 25
1256 23–24, 29, 48, 82, 225, 257
1263 43
1275 252
1281 69, 87, 222
1284 24, 27, 42–43, 71, 94, 112–114, 170, 212, 256
1292 282
1298 58, 85, 217
1299 86
1304 21, 64–65, 86, 113, 130, 249
1310 86
1313 23, 48, 75–76, 82, 84, 119, 130, 225, 262
1316 86
1324 86
1328 86
1329 21–22, 249, 299
1330 19
1332 24, 75

IG II^3 (cont.)
1333 86
1334 84
1372 85, 246
1386 51, 54, 93, 246

IG IV
558 295

IG IV^2
1.148–149 272

IG V
2.4 286

IG IX^2
2.583 283
2.1109 295

IG XI
1.278 294
4.765 47
4.776 47
4.792 47
4.1052 287
4.1061 294

IG XII
1.677 285
3.27 40
3.511 290
3.1121 290
5.481 294
5.718 286
6.1 286
6.2.597 287
7.49 40
7.233 288
7.234 287
8.52 47
8.150 47
8.156 295
9.954 284

I. Halikarnassos
15 290

I. Hierapolis
30 290

I. Iasos
93 287

I. Knidos
147–59 292–293
149 and 152 285
231 286
220 47

I. Labraunda
42 286

I. Lindos
252 294

I. Magnesia
85 283
89 295
100a 295

IMT
183 290

I. Mylasa
101 286
127 286
141 290
891 287

I. Oropos
290 50, 52–54
294 38, 50, 53, 295
299 99, 206, 245

I. Patmos
1 38

I. Priene^2
55 288
60 286
61 284
64 287–*288*, 290
65 294

I. Prose
6 290, 295
25 295

I. Rhamnous II
3 31, 221
6 20, 61
7 136–137
17 20, 67, 97, 221
22 28, 47, 68, 221
23 47, 68, 221
26 68, 118, 221
31 69, 74, 98, 221, 246
32 68, 98, 114, 221
38 68, 221
49 68, 221
50 20, 68, 82, 221
54 74
59 31, 44, 47, 98, 221, 249
129 221
136 221
148–152 221
167 99

I. Rhod. Peraia
121 287
251 285

I. Sardis
4 and 22 295

I. Sestos
1 287

I. Sinuri
9 287
10 287, 294
15 287

I. Smyrna
573 286, 295

I. Stratonikeia
9 290, 295
103 290
512 294

IvO
16 286

Lambert, 2012
#6 21, 50, 54, 57, 85, 87
#9 85

M&L
#15 195
#23 63, 66, 277
#40 127
#44 125
#49 127
#52 63, 156
#58 53, 204
#73 129

MAMA
5.108 284

MDAI
66.#4 47, 82, 281

Perrin-Saminadayar, 2007
T26 20, 23, 26, 48, 58, 72, 75–76, 82, 84, 112, 130, 157, 225–226, 262–263
T30 23, 29, 72, 75–76, 84, 92, 97, 118, 226, 256, 281, 284

RC
9 294

Rigsby
#39 294
#66 38
#96 295
#102 38
#107 290, 294
#112 294
#113 294
#161 47

R&O
#6 84
#27 51

R&O (cont.)
#37 *115*, 118–119, 121, 232, 236
#41 195–196
#46 31, 45, 48, 50, 52–55, 57, 112, 201, 249
#63 53, 61
#88 114, 170, 225, 286

Schwenk
#13 27, 74
#18 122
#52 33, 48
#54 52
#65 28, 44
#66 28, 70, 100, 244, 246
#70 24
#77 44, 74, 211

SEG
2.7 24
3.115 224
3.116 68
12.399 283
14.47 139
15.104 23–24, 29, 47, 72, 75–76, 85, 87–88, 97, 130, 225–226, 257–258
16.65 24, 26–27, 30, 60
17.69 38
18.19 26, 30, 43, 47–48, 51, 54–55, 57, 85–86, 114, 249, 262
18.22 43–44, 51, 54–55, 57, 84–85, 87–88, 140, 262
18.24 44
18.26 19, 51, 57, 85, 87–88, 92–93, 114
18.27 38, 51, 57, 87, 92–93
18.189 295
19.124 298
21.357 224, 242
21.469C 15, *20*, 47, 58–60, 63–64, 66, 82, 110–111, 113, 121, 135–137, 158, 166, 170, 172–*173*, 175–176, 181–182, 205, 217–220, 256, 283
21.519 32, 150, 161, 177
21.525 224
21.541 61, 100, 235–236
22.110 26, 29, 48, 92, 225
22.117 61, 86
25.140 112, 140, 157, 172
25.149 22, *136*, 142
25.221 74
25.226 102, 260
28.45 136
28.60 25, 99, 138, 245
29.116 76
29.135 21, 33, 51–52, 93, 101, 118, 153, 251
29.146 206, 208
32.100 85
32.110 114, 171
32.216 74
32.218 15, 93, 96–97, 157, 215, 234
32.1167 40, 295
33.115 4–6, 14, 43, 50, 52–54, 57, 82, 85, 87, 114, 170, 251, 262
33.147 200
33.675 294
34.95 140, 220
34.103 28, 70, 244–245
36.186 25, 28, 70–71, 244, 246, 257
36.187 39
36.269 223
38.440 284
39.125 29, 70, 82, 215, 239, 246
39.148 25
40.107 21
40.121 27, 70, 96, 238
40.170 113
41.75 61
42.100 25
42.116 93
42.1065 290
42.1072 25
43.26 25, 61, 150, 245
44.42 61, 137
44.60 24, 114, 153, 179
45.101 20, 29, 44, 66, 82, *95*, 112, 172, 218, 245, 252
45.116 bis 252
45.126 38
45.911 272
46.122 166
46.148 69, 224

46.167 224
47.197 223
47.232 157
48.1089 bis 287
48.1112 287
49.141 61
50.143 244
50.168 61, *100*, 235
50.766 295
52.48 59, 106, *167*, 199, 232, 235
52.104 34, 134
53.143 *26*, 143
54.57 286
54.114 127
54.214 237
54.171 211
54.224 61
55.307 260
56.203 30, 42–43, 72, 101, 246, 251
57.124 137
59.152 24
59.155 24, 114, 153

SGDI
2677 47

Sylloge^{3}
737 290

TAM
III.1 285

Index of Other Texts Cited

Aelian
VH 2.25 125

Aeschines
1. 6 170
10 123
11 29
13 118
23 110–111, 122, 169–170, 191
129 41
160 43
183 12
188 124
2. 151 26
163 38, 46
176 38
3. 13–24 239
17–18 123, 199–200
19 38
120 41, 92
131 281
152 281
176 12, 122
187 136, 197
191 285
[Epist.] 10.6 27

Aeschylus
Cho. 139–41 39
Th. 379 280
1010 279

Anaximenes *Rh. Alex.* 3, 185–188
2.3–12 185
2.3–4 111, 173, 178
2.5 258–259
2.11 173
38.12 173

Andocides
1. 19 285
23 285
27 129
71–7 129
83 111
88 170
110 134
111 122, 298
115–16 134, 285, 298

Antiphon
1. 5 285
25 284
5. 82 41, 118
83 279
91 284
6. 7 44
11 127
33 38
37 118
45 62, 66, 74, 205, 208, 277
48 285
51 40, 46, 285
83 279
Tetra. 1.2.12 252, 258
1.4.12 288
2.2.12 46, 288
2.3.12 44
3.2.9 288
3.4.10–11 284
3.5.14 284
3.6.2 284
3.30.19 39

Aristophanes
Ach. 253–4 257–258
791–2 256
1000–1001 111, 115, 170
Av. 848–903 19, 50
878–9 6
958–991 19
1118 279
1515–24 19
Eccl. 781 88
Nub. 299–313 264
Pax 937–1126 19
Plut. 63 86

	676–81	50
	1159	156
	1185	118
Thesm.	310	88
Vesp.	540–5	258
Aristotle		
EE	3.1233a31–b14	252
EN	4.1122a18–1123a34	252
	4.1122b21–4	29, 258
	4.1125b	43
	8.1163b3–8	41
	10.1179a24–5	49
Pol.	1.1253a35–6	285
	2.1267b33–35	118
	2.1272a20	23
	3.1278a12	23
	3.1279a11	23
	3.1285b16–17	59, 218
	4.1291a35–7	23
	5.1305a5	23
	5.1309a17–20	23, 29
	5.1314b14	23
	6.1320b4	23
	6.1321a33	23
	6.1321a35–6	252
	6.1321a37–9	262
	6.1322b26–9	122
	6.1322b18–19	83
	7.1323a1–3	71
	7.1330a13	23
	7.1331a24–30	260
	7.1335b28	23
Protrep.	Frag. 2.8	258
	Frag. 12	258
Rh.	1383a-b	41
	1383b4–6	20
Frag.	101	255
	532	88
[Aristotle]		
Ath.Pol.		
	2.9	91
	3.3	112, 167, 217, 219
	21.6	154, 170, 272
	21.8–9	217
	21.13	217
	27.3	253
	29.5	23
	39.2	111, 169, 299
	43.6	170, 191
	47.1	204, 209
	49.3	204–205
	50.1	209–210
	54.6–7	73, 118, 205, 209, 212, 281
	54.8	191
	56.3–5	171, 212, 217
	56.3	29
	56.4	58, 94, 171, 209
	56.22–6	71
	57.1–4	71, 299
	57.1	59, 110–112, 168–169, 209, 218, 298–299
	57.2	218
	57.10–16	71
	58.1–4	60
	58.1	219
	60.1–3	213–214, 217
	60.1	205
	62.2	213
VV	1250b17	111
	1251a38–9	111
Craterus		
FGrHist	342	
F 16	129	
Democharas		
FGrHist	75	
F 1	141	
Demosthenes		
4.	26	220, 222–224
	35–6	175
	45	282
[7.]	40	260
10.	28	23
[11.]	16	40
18.	7	45
	126	38, 45
	216–18	136, 197
	241	38
	243	118

Demosthenes (cont.)

	257	29, 41
	282	122
19.	70	170
	73	38
	128	113, 170, 205
	132	38
	156	285
	190	62, 66
	272	195
20.	19	29
	28	127
	126	38
21.	8–9	126
	10–11	126, 297
	13	126
	51–6	126, 171, 176, 268–275
	51	112–113, 156
	52–3	112, 156, 163, 272–275, 281
	54	112–113, 171
	56–7	23, 126
	67–9	29, 95
	104	38
	114	38, 62, 74
	115	73–74, 194, 209
	156	253
	159	95, 258
	165	23
	171	223
	174	223
	175–181	126
	175–6	297
	175	126
	180	126
	199	126
	227	38
22.	13	262
	28	38
	69–78	34, 204
	72	38
	73	124
	76	196, 261
	97	45
23.	29	35–36
	40	285
	97	38, 45, 122
[24.]	4–5	141
	27–9	133
	28	257
	34	45
	104	38
	180–1	38, 196
	184	261
25.	34	260
	52–3	38
	54	38
	63	38
28.	16	285
29.	128	219
33.	10	285
39.	41	45
43.	58	121
	62–7	267–268
	66	115, 269, 272–273
53.	3	285
[59.]	73	112, 115, 168, 218
	75–6	118–119, 168
	77	252
	78	22, 119
	79	119
	85–6	12, 118–119, 124, 218
	104	286
	116	35, 115, 169, 238
[60.]	27	170
	29	280
[*Epist.*]	3.31	110
Prooem.	54	6, 276–278

Dinarchus

1.	21	38
	47	122
	82	205
	84	45–46
	87	40
	94	141
	110	110
2.	10	284
	14	122
	16	122
	18	118
Frag.	20	202

Diodorus Siculus
1.23.5 83
1.28.6–7 162
4.39.1 294
5.3.2 263
5.43.2–3 263
5.49.6 39
11.62.3 195
13.102.2 195
20.46.1–4 141

Diogenes Laertius
1.110 158–159

Ephorus
FGrHist 70
F 16 88
F 158 40

Euripides
El. 781–843 19
886–7 40
1362–3 40
Hec. 108–9 280
118–19 280
265–70 256
557–65 256
Hel. 1559–89 19
1632 40
HF 922–41 19
IA 926–7 40
Med. 684 40
Ion 658 280
815 280
842 280
Or. 627–8 39
1650–2 40
Suppl. 373–4 253
Frag. 327 39

Hecataeus
FGrHist 264
F 25 32

Heraclides Ponticus
Frag. 46b 295

Herodas
4.79–84 279, 281–282

Herodotus
1.48.1 86
1.49.1 119
1.59.1 279
1.63.1 86
1.64.2 162
1.159 285
1.172.2 116, 279
2.45.3 282
2.63.1 278
2.81 285
2.115.4 285
2.121ε2 285
2.141 38
4.76.3 252
5.44.2 279–280
5.60–1 261
5.89.2–3 154
6.57.1 12
6.76.1–2 281
6.82.1 281
6.111 88
6.112.1 280
6.117 125
7.113.2 281
7.133 281
7.134.2 281
7.140.1 119
7.167.1 281
7.180 256
8.26.2 259
8.54 279
8.105–6 285
9.19.2 281
9.19.5–7 281
9.36 279
9.38.1–2 281
9.45.2 280
9.61.3 280
9.78.1 285
9.91.1 86

Homer
Il. 1.147 280
1.446–74 19
8.238 260
8.249 260
10.292 280
11.727–9 256, 280

Homer *Il.* (cont.)
23.195 256, 280
23.209 256, 280
Ody. 1.61 280
3.5–6 280
3.418–63 19, 256
4.472–3 256, 280
5.102 280
7.190–1 256, 280
11.130–1 256, 280
14.414–45 19
22.412 284
23.277–80 280
[*Hymn to Aphrodite*] 101 256
[*Hymn to Apollo*] 273–4 256
[*Hymn to Demeter*] 29 256

Hyperides
4. 6 218
14–15 180–181
24–26 32, 48, 162, 194, 261, 263
5. frag. 7 141
6. 21–22 141

Isaeus
2. 4 118
4. 19 285
5. 42 33, 261–262
6. 47–50 123–124
49 38
7. 40 28
8. 15–16 6, 19
9. 34 284

Isocrates
1. 13 40–41
3. 2 46
13 289
4. 28 282
31 113, 129, 160, 169
33 40, 295
44–5 258–259
5. 57 284
117 89
7. 29–30 110, 119, 166–167, 173, 252
66 262
8. 33–4 46
63 46
82 126
120 38
135 47, 295
9. 2 252
26 289
38 289
39 39
51 283
11. 26 283
27 28, 294
28 283
12. 121–2 283, 291
124 46
163 40
170 284
182 38
203 38
204 46
14. 2 284
22 283
39 284
15. 76 284
234 262
282 40, 284
321–2 38, 289
16. 34 89, 252
17. 33–4 205
19. 33 118
36 252
Frag. 20 38

Livy
31.14.11–15.7 142–143

Lycurgus
Leoc. 1–2 38, 45, 166, 176
15 251
25 111
52 284
77 170, 285
93 38
96 282
102 125

	129	119
	139–40	253, 258
	142	123
Frag.	6.2	237
	6.4	125
	7	202
Lysias		
2.	9	118
[6.]	4	59, 110, 112, 169, 298
	12	46
	17	38
	33	204
	45	38
	51	201
12.	99	47
13.	4	284
	82	222
14.	42–3	43
19.	56–7	253
	58	23
21.	1–5	29, 94–95
25.	12–13	253
26.	6–8	58, 110, 122, 170, 216
30.	17	121, 167
	18	173
	19–21	89, 110–111, 121, 167–168, 173
	25	286
	29	168
31.	15	23
	31	116
33.	2	259
Frag.	125	118
	195	38
	246	45
Melanthius		
FGrHist	326	
	F 2	129
	F 4	115, 169
Menander		
Dys.	436–75	19
	567–8	256
	646	30
Kolax, frag.	1	6
Sam.	274	40
Frag.	264.8	281
Pausanias		
	1.3.4	160
	1.22.3	196, 277
	1.28.2	195
	1.32.5	155
	3.3.7	159
	5.21.5–6	163
	10.10–19	195
Philochorus		
FGrHist	328	
	F 12	41
	F 67	115
	F 73	115, 169
	F 116	142
	F 155	138
	F 168	12
	F 171	259
Pindar		
Isth.	5.30	89
Plato		
[*Alc.* II]	148e	28
	148e5–149a4	255, 262
	149c1–4	92, 256
	150a	28
	151b1–2	118
Cri.	54b8	284
Euthphr.	283	
	2a3–4	218
	2b	46
	14b	35
Grg.	514a5-c4	260
	525d6	285, 289
Hp.Mai.	291e2	252
Ion	535d2	89
Lg.	2.657d	259, 284
	5.738b5-c3	178
	6.759a8-b1	170
	6.767d2	284
	7.791a7–8	281
	7.800b	89
	7.835b2–3	22
	9.872d7	284–285
	10.905d.2–3	49
	10.907b5–6	49
	11.935b6	12
	12.959c1	284

Plato (cont.)
Menex. 234c3 252
249b4 118
Meno 81b6 284
Phd. 58b4-c5 123
62b7 49
Pol. 290e3–8 59, 168, 218
Prot. 349d7 285
359b3 285
Rep. 1.327a1–5 27, 257
1.331a3–8 289
2.362c2 252
3.394a 89
5.468d 89
5.475a9-b2 65
Smp. 176a1–4 118
178d 43
180d 48
197d 89
[*Thg.*] 122e 30

Plutarch
Alc. 22.4 201
33.3 201
Cim. 8.6–7 66, 159, 169, 220
Dem. 10.4 141
11.1 141
12.1–2 142
13.1–2 142
26.1–3 141
Mor. 275d 201
338a 141
862c 125, 195, 219
Nic. 3.1–2 253
3.3 263–264
3.4–5 259
24 66
Per. 14 196
32.1–2 129
Phoc. 9.1–2 99
13 66
Sol. 12.5 159
Them. 13 66
Thes. 36.1–3 159, 169
[*X.Orat.*] 841d 98
841f–842b 132–134
842a 297
843f–844a 98, 161, 260
852b 261

Polybius 16.25.3–9 143

Porphry *De Abst.* II.59 178

Sophocles
Ant. 1005–11 19
Ph. 85 40
1033 279

Strabo 9.2.11 157

Theocritus
Id. 2.72 27

Theophrastus
Char. 21 87, 208, 250, 276

Theopompus
FGrHist 115
F 344 22, 295

Thucydides
2.13.5 192
2.15.3 12
2.16.2 171
2.44.4 41
2.45 251
3.58.5 110
3.67.2 284
3.104.1–2 161
4.92.7 279
5.1.1 162
5.18.2 111
5.32.1 162
6.16.1–4 253
6.16.3 258
6.32.1 118
6.69.2 119, 280
8.70 205

Xanthus
FGrHist 765
F 10 40

Xenophon
Ages. 8.7 89
11.1 38

Ana. 1.8.15 280
2.2.3 279
3.2.12 125, 195, 219
4.3.9 279
5.4.22 281
6.1.22 73, 92
7.6.3 252
7.8.5 281
Ap. 5 288
13 284
Cyn. 13.17 38, 40
Cyr. 6.2.6 252
6.4.12 281
7.5.56 284
HG 2.4.21–2 285
3.1.17 281
3.3.4 281
4.1.22 281
4.2.18 279
4.4.2–3 285
7.2.21 279
7.3.6 285
7.4.5 284
Hiero 1.11 259
Hipp.
1.1 68–69, 222–223
2.1 27, 223, 257
3.1–5 223, 257
3.1 27, 222–223, 281
3.2 28, 224
5.11 223
5.14 223
6.4–5 223
6.6 69
7.1 222
7.4 223
7.14 223
9.8–9 69, 223
Lac. 4.2 259
13.3 281
Mem. 1.1.19 49
1.1.20 40
1.3.1 178
1.3.2 88
1.3.3 40
1.4.14 49
2.2.13 35
3.3.12–3 259
3.6.3 41
3.8.10 260
4.3.12 49
4.3.16 35–36, 39
4.3.17 41, 48
4.3.18 39
4.8.2 123
4.8.11 46
Oec. 2.5 252
5.3 260
7.9 258
8.3 259
9.6 257
Smp. 1.2 259
4.17 258
4.48 49
8.40 30
Vect. 1.4 260
5.4 259
6.1 252
6.3 281

Index of Greek Phrases

Included under each entry are cognate expressions and English translations.

ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ (τῆς θεᾶς) 26–27, 31–33, 48, 55, 263

δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας 25, 46

ἐπάνδρως 23–24, 29, 48
ἐπὶ τῇ ὑγιείᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ 4–6
εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας 5, 25, 32–33, 43–45, 54, 242–243, 249
εὐσεβῶς διακείμενος 40, 289, 294–295
εὐσεβῶς ἔχων 34, 38, 276
εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως 23, 33, 97, 249
εὐσχημόνως 23–24, 26–27, 29, 48, 55, 256–258
εὐτάκτως 24

θυσίαι καθήκουσαι 4–6, 65, 71, 82–83, 217
θυσίαι προσήκουσαι 4–5, 58, 82–83

καλῶς καὶ δικαίως 25, 31, 61, 287
καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς 5–7, 19–22, 31, 33–37, 39, 41, 55, 58, 70, 97, 158, 166, 242–243, 249, 255, 262–263, 282
καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως 26–27, 29, 257
καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως 5, 21, 24–33, 41–43, 65, 130, 242–243, 249–252, 263
καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια 87–89, 276–277

ὅπως ἂν ἔχῃ καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς 6, 20–21, 34, 39
ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως 286–290

πάτριοι θυσίαι 22, 59, 110–111, 115, 158, 167–168, 181, 214–215, 217–218, 240, 242
περὶ πλείστου ποιούμενοι τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν 22, 28, 31, 38–39, 47, 55, 124, 172–173, 242, 246, 249

τὰ ἀγαθά 4–7, 52, 69, 73, 86–89, 135, 213, 242, 276–277
τὰ ἐπίθετα 112, 166–168, 174, 181, 240
τὰ ἱερά 6, 7, 10–11
- as “sacred matters” or “sacred things” 10–11, 94, 118, 120, 122–123, 128, 150, 170, 174, 185–188, 191, 236, 240, 259–260, 270, 277, 279–282, 285–286, 297, 299
- as “sacrificial victims” 4, 76, 87–89, 173, 185, 250, 256–257, 276–277, 279–282
- as “sanctuaries” 68, 83, 123, 170–171, 262, 279–282
- τὰ ἱερὰ καλά 6–7, 76, 87–89, 250, 255–257, 276, 279–282

τὰ νομιζόμενα 118–119, 122, 153, 167, 173, 267–268
τὰ νόμιμα 116, 119, 137, 153
τὰ ὅσια 10, 35, 120, 122, 150, 170, 191, 283, 285–286
τὰ πάτρια 15, 35, 52, 58–59, 61, 70, 109–119, 122, 124, 128–130, 133, 138, 151–153, 156, 165–174, 178–182, 185–188, 203, 217, 219, 226, 229, 238–243, 248
- κατὰ τὰ πάτρια 7, 20–21, 58, 70, 109, 111–113, 116, 122, 130, 138, 152, 156–160, 167–173, 178–179, 185, 203, 218, 242, 267–270, 298–299, 301

ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑγιείας καὶ σωτηρίας 4–6, 49, 51–52, 57–58, 61, 63, 69, 72, 86–90, 98, 100–101, 135, 157, 197, 204, 207, 217, 242–243, 274

General Index

Acamantes 61, 78
Achaia 61, 78
Adonia 116
Aeacus 154–155, 163, 177
Agathe Thea 30, 42, 72, 101, 105, 137, 246, 251
Agathe Tyche 64, 66–67, 74, 79, 134, 136–137, 141, 145, 166, 191, 197, 210–211, 246, 261–262
Agathos Daimon 208
Aglauros 4–5, 43, 52, 57, 114, 116, 170, 225, 262
  See also priests and priestesses
agones 1–2, 28–29, 37, 48, 59, 91, 94–95, 106, 113, 127, 143–144, 166, 192, 202–203, 205, 211, 215–216, 218, 225, 230–234, 237, 239–243, 303, 305–306
  beauty of 29, 48, 242–243, 257–258, 263
  of Aetolian Soteria 28
  of Amphieraia 25, 131–132, 144, 212
  of Bendis 144
  of Demeter and Kore 95, 214
  of Demetrius and Antigonus 141
  of Dionysia
    at Acharnai 25, 61, 151
    at Aixone 100
    at Eleusis 29, 61
    in city 28–29, 58, 94–95, 113–114, 117, 132, 171, 214–217, 232, 235, 242–243, 257–258, 268–269
  of Epitaphia 60, 119, 144
  of Hephaisteia 74, 127, 210
  of Haloa 110, 117
  of Lenaia 59, 132, 147, 218
  of Panathenaia 96, 127, 129, 147, 214–215, 232–233, 242, 257
  of Poseidon in Piraeus 132, 147
  of Thargelia 58, 217
  of Theseia 29, 47, 96, 148, 233, 257
agonothetai 19, 22, 27–29, 43, 47, 69–70, 80–83, 85, 87, 90, 94–96, 103–104, 110–111, 113–114, 117, 197, 204–205, 211, 214–217, 230–239, 241–243, 245–247, 250–251, 258, 303
  of Delia 96, 215, 232
  of Diasia 96, 215
  of Eleusinia 96, 215
  of Panathenaia 38, 70, 95–96, 104, 215–216
  of Theseia 27, 29, 70, 80, 82, 96, 104, 111, 138, 215, 233–235
agoronomoi 28, 303
Ajax and Aianteia 59, 66, 71, 75–76, 80–81, 170, 217, 220, 225
Akeso 202
Alcibiades 201, 252, 300
Alcmene 50
Alekrone of Ialysus 284
Alexander III 13, 140–141, 149
Alochos 156, 177
altars 11, 31–34, 92, 102–103, 127, 134, 138, 148, 158–159, 164, 177–178, 194, 196–197, 231, 269, 272
  beauty of 9, 34, 260, 263
  in Pelargikon 127, 148
  of Aphrodite Pandemos 138
  of Apollo Patroös 98, 161, 164, 177, 260
  of Artemis of Brauron 134
  of Asclepius 102
  of Athena Areia and Ares 32, 151, 161, 164, 177
  of Athena Nike 128, 149
  of Athena Polias 210, 260
  of Demetrius and Antigonus 141, 150
  of Dionysus 70, 122, 272, 273
  of Hephaestus 128, 148, 210
  of Kalliste 53, 93
  of Zeus Soter 260
Ammon 31, 48, 50, 66, 166, 178, 263
Amphiaraia 24–25, 27, 71, 73, 81, 131, 137, 143–144, 145, 171, 191, 197, 205, 209, 212, 214, 244, 257
Amphiaraus
  of Oropos 24–25, 27, 49, 75, 80, 99, 103, 114, 116, 131–132, 134, 162–164, 171, 175, 177–178, 180, 197, 206, 212, 225, 230, 261
    See also priests and priestesses
  of Rhamnous 99, 103
Amphieraestae 99, 103
Amphiones 267–268, 273
Amynos 244, 247
Anakes 193

Anaxagoras 129
Anios of Delos 93
Anthesteria 117, 174, 218
Antigonus Gonatas 4–5, 33, 52, 61, 69, 78, 97, 137, 228, 242–243, 286
Antigonos Monophthalmus 64, 79, 136–137, 141, 145, 147, 149–150, 197
Antiochus
  the eponymous hero 224
  the king 294
aparchai 303
  of Bendis 125, 179
  of Eleusis 62–63, 78, 112, 117, 127–129, 133–134, 144, 146, 159–160, 164, 169, 175–177, 194, 205, 227, 297–298
  of Pythaïs 93, 96, 104, 157
Aphrodite 83, 102, 105, 114, 140, 149, 153, 220, 247, 256
  Euploia 221
  Hagne of Delos 231
  Hegemone 68, 79, 98, 206, 221
  in the Gardens 193
  of Syria 51, 86, 114, 247, 251
  Ourania of Cition 116, 143, 149, 179, 194
  Pandemos 113, 116, 138, 145, 170, 260, 277
  Synarchis of Samos 287
Apollo 4, 15, 33, 40, 52, 58–60, 66, 77, 110, 114, 116, 121, 127, 136–137, 148, 158, 166, 175, 178, 181, 194–197, 202, 206, 217–219, 224, 228, 256, 276–277
  Agyieus 267–270
  Alexikakos 160
  Apotropaios 270, 275
  Delios of Phaleron 125, 144, 170, 193, 260
  Erithaseos 52, 139
  Lykeios 205, 236
  of Delos 93
  Patroös 59, 64, 77, 79, 98, 113, 116–117, 136, 145, 158, 160–164, 170, 177, 181, 191, 193, 207, 229, 260
  Prostaterios 63, 65, 70, 78, 113–117, 170–171, 197, 204, 207, 269–270, 274
  Pythios 28, 31, 58–60, 63–64, 77–79, 82, 115, 125, 138, 157–159, 170, 193, 195, 205, 217–220, 229, 260
    of Delphi 93, 117, 260
      See also oracles
  Soter 267–268, 272, 274
  Zoster 31, 48, 50, 52–55, 112, 117, 193
Aratus 67
archons 58–59, 77, 83, 93, 97, 110, 118, 169–170, 202, 211, 216, 228, 230, 234, 236, 240, 244, 303
  eponymous 3, 13–14, 19, 27, 43, 58–59, 66, 71, 77, 79, 81–83, 85, 87, 90, 109, 112, 126, 130, 135–136, 145, 167, 171, 177, 181, 194, 197, 212, 216–217, 219–220, 237, 240, 303
  of Mesogeioi 27, 112, 117, 131
Areopagus Council 173, 209
  See also keryx
Ares 4, 32, 40, 52, 114, 116, 151, 161, 164, 170, 177, 225
aresteria 63, 66, 139–140, 205, 298
Ariarathes 38, 45
Aristogiton 60, 77, 141, 219, 229
Artemis 152, 211, 247, 267–270
  Agrotera 60, 77, 125, 144, 192, 195, 219, 229
  Aristoboule 13, 194
  Boulaia 62–63, 65, 78, 113, 117, 170–171, 197, 205
  Brauronia 13, 134–135, 149, 161, 193, 205, 261
  Kuria of Termessus 285
  Leukophryene of Magnesia on the Meander 294–295
  Mounychia 75, 81, 193, 225
  of Delos 93
  of Oinoe 232
  Phosphoros 63, 78, 113, 117, 171
Asclepiastae 246
Asclepieia 51, 58, 74, 87, 166, 171, 210–211, 216, 285
Asclepius 162, 164, 191, 250, 282
  of city 26, 27, 29–30, 48, 51, 57, 59–60, 80, 87, 89, 102–103, 105, 114, 117, 134, 136, 139, 149, 157, 171, 194, 229, 246, 260–262
    See also priests and priestesses
  of Piraeus 52, 59, 65, 71–72, 80, 136–137, 202, 207, 209, 212–213, 216, 229
  of Rhamnous 75, 81, 98, 221
  of Salamis 75, 81, 225
  of Sunium 98, 221
asebeia 34–35, 126, 129, 148, 162, 169, 177, 193, 203, 206–207, 218, 238, 268–269, 298, 300

astynomoi 24, 26–28, 30, 60, 113, 116, 138, 145, 251, 303
Athena 62–63, 74, 144, 193, 256, 280
  Archegetis 64, 79, 138, 207
  Areia 32, 114, 151, 161, 164, 177, 225
  Boulaia 62, 205
  Hephaistia 63, 127, 206
  Hygieia 73, 80, 117, 210
  Hypata 267–268, 272–273
  Itonia 134, 261
  Kynthia of Delos 231
  Nike 26, 33, 63–64, 73, 75, 79, 80–81, 98, 125, 128, 136–137, 139, 141, 145, 148–149, 191–192, 197, 204, 210, 225, 229, 256, 260, 277
    See also priests and priestesses
  Pallenis 193
  Parthenos 192, 194
  Promachos 194–195
  Polias 73, 75, 80–81, 98, 117–118, 125, 132, 141, 149, 150, 169–170, 187, 191, 194–196, 204, 210, 214, 220, 222, 225, 229, 236, 245, 261–262
    See also priests and priestesses
  Soteira
    of city 57, 64–65, 71, 75, 79, 80–81, 207, 209, 212, 225, 229, 262, 276–278
    of Piraeus 71, 80, 229
    of Rhamnous 68–69, 79, 98, 104, 221
Athenaia 74
athlothetai 70, 127, 147, 213–215, 230, 239, 242, 303
Attalus I 143, 150, 287, 290
Attalus II 40, 289
Attis and Attideia 30, 47, 53
audits *See euthynai*
Auxo 114, 225

Basile 128
Basileia 68, 222
basileus 3, 13, 58–60, 66, 77–79, 82–83, 109–112, 115, 117–118, 121–122, 127, 136, 139, 148, 150, 167–169, 171, 174, 181, 207, 216–219, 227, 229, 240, 296, 298–299, 303
  wife of 112, 115, 117–118, 122, 150, 168, 174, 218
Bendideia 27, 48, 74, 105, 125, 144, 152, 166, 210–211
Bendis 20, 27, 33, 48, 74, 102, 105, 114–116, 125, 144–145, 152–153, 156, 163, 176–180, 182, 192–194, 229–230, 246–247, 257
Berenice 142
boönai 66–67, 70, 209–210, 303
Brauronia 73, 205, 209, 212

calendars, sacred 11
  of Erchia 61, 100, 104–105, 235
  of Marathon Tetrapolis 60–61, 78, 100, 104–105, 235
  of Nicomachus 106, 109, 144, 167–168, 173, 176, 191–192, 199, 218, 232, 235, 240
  of Salaminioi 121
  of Solon *See* Solon
Callias of Sphettos 98–99, 103, 138, 147
Chalkeia 26, 64, 75, 79, 81, 138, 145, 207, 225
charis 20, 35–36, 40, 186, 188, 246–247, 253, 256–257, 304
Charites 58, 72, 75–76, 80, 206, 224–225
Chloia 61, 78, 81, 101, 114, 117
Choes 111, 115, 117, 170
choregoi
  of city 28–29, 41, 44, 58, 70, 91, 94–95, 103–104, 126–127, 133, 145, 148, 214–215, 217, 230, 232, 235, 241, 252, 258, 263, 268–269, 273, 304
  of demes 70–71, 100, 104, 244–247
chresmologoi 156, 177, 290
Cimon 159, 263
Cleisthenes 154, 170, 194, 203
Codrus 30, 121, 128, 148
couch, spreading of 29–30
  of Agathe Thea 30
  of Asclepius 51
  of Attis 30, 47, 53, 153
  of Mother of the Gods 153
  of Plouton 53, 161
  of Zeus Soter 212
Cronus 289
curse tablets 285, 292–293

dadouchos 141, 160
decrees *See psephismata*
dedications 2, 12, 33–34, 37, 39, 92–93, 100–104, 134–136, 138–139, 142, 148–149, 161–164, 175, 190, 192, 194–198, 203, 205–209, 218–219, 221, 230, 239, 244–245, 252, 262

dedications (cont.)
at Delphi 142, 195
beauty of 9, 33–34, 161, 243, 261–264
on Delos 231
repair and remaking of 33–34, 51–53, 139–140, 142, 149, 161, 175, 196–197, 204, 220, 230, 239, 261–262
to Agathe Tyche 134, 261
to Agathos Daimon 208
to Amphiaraus 49, 99, 103, 134, 206, 245, 261
to Aphrodite 140, 149, 220
Euploia 221
Hegemone 206
Ourania 143
Synarchis of Samos 287
to Apollo 64, 113, 195
Patroös 161
Soter of Epidaurus 272
to Artemis 211
to Artemis Brauronia 34, 134, 161, 261
to Asclepius 51–52, 103, 134, 139–140, 149, 162, 164, 250, 261
to Athena 208
Hephaistia 63, 206
Hypata of Epidaurus 272
Itonia 134, 261
Nike 33, 139
Polias 34, 92, 139, 148, 194–196, 204, 206, 214, 261
Soteira 221
to Charites 206
to Demeter and Kore 94, 115, 117, 134, 161, 196, 206, 222, 224, 261, 298, 300
to Demokratia 206
to Dione of Dodona 270, 274
to Dionysus 70, 134, 217, 261
Lenaios 221
of Dionysiastae 102, 261
to Dioscouroi 195–196
to eponymous heroes 206, 208
to Erechtheus 208
to Hephaestus 63, 206
to Hermes 211, 217, 223–224
Eisagogos of Samos 287
Hegemonios 66, 221
to Heros Iatros 33–34, 53, 139–140, 149, 204, 220, 261–262
to Heros Strategos 221
to Kalliste 53, 93
to Kallistephanos 261
to Leos 208
to Mother of the Gods 55, 130, 143, 149, 211, 226
to Nemesis 221
to Themis 221
to Theseus 211
to Twelve Gods 206
to Zeus
of Dodona 163–164, 270
Olympios 134, 261
Soter 134, 221, 261
Deipnophoria 115, 117, 232
Delia 58, 73, 96, 123, 146, 174, 205, 209, 212, 215, 217, 232, 259
demarchs 13, 52, 60–61, 78, 227–228, 251, 257, 304
of Archarnai 25, 151, 228
of Eleusis 29, 78, 81, 85, 87, 101, 104, 111, 114, 117, 197, 228, 233, 298
of Erchia 61, 228, 298
of Hagnous 61, 78, 81, 228
of Ikarion 25, 61, 78, 81, 86, 228
of Kollytos 61
of Marathon 60, 78, 228
of Piraeus 151, 228
of Rhamnous 20, 61, 78, 81, 228
of Skambonidai 61, 228
demes 1–3, 7–8, 11–13, 24, 44–46, 48, 50–51, 57, 60–61, 63, 67, 70–71, 74, 91–93, 100–101, 104–106, 109, 119, 129, 136–137, 151, 171, 175–176, 189–190, 200–202, 213, 228–229, 232, 235–237, 244–247, 250–251, 257, 304–305
See also demarchs
Demeter 128, 142, 150, 162, 256
of Athens 13, 59, 77, 128, 134, 146, 169, 218, 222, 297–298
of Cnidus 285, 292–293
of Eleusis 61–62, 64, 68, 71, 78–80, 94–95, 98, 101, 104, 114, 117, 124, 128–129, 133–134, 136, 142, 150, 160–162, 164, 169, 174–176, 191, 195–196, 205, 207, 214, 222, 224, 227, 229, 236, 238, 240, 261–262, 296–300
See also priests and priestesses
of Phaleron 128

Demetrieia 142, 145, 150
Demetrius of Phaleron 94–95, 214, 232, 241
Demetrius Poliorcetes 22, 64, 67, 79, 136, 141–142, 145, 147, 149–150, 197
Demokratia 66, 166, 206
Demos 58, 72, 75–76, 80, 224–225
Dexion 244, 247
Diagoras of Melos 129, 146, 300
Diasia 96, 215, 230, 236
dikaiosune 25, 31, 34, 39, 45–46, 54–55, 61, 75, 130–131, 169, 187–188, 201, 218, 283–289, 292–293, 298, 301
Diomus 50
Dione 32–33, 48, 162–164, 177, 261, 263, 270, 273, 275
Dionysia
  of Acharnai 25, 61, 151, 228
  of Aixone 24–25, 100, 257
  of city 25, 48, 58–59, 66–67, 70–72, 75–81, 85, 90, 94–95, 103, 112–114, 117, 125–127, 132, 142, 145, 150, 156–157, 163, 166, 171, 175, 177–178, 191, 193, 197, 204, 207, 209, 212, 214, 217, 220, 225, 227, 232, 235, 237, 239–240, 243, 257, 259, 263, 268, 273–274
    See also agones; *pompai*
  of Eleusis 24–25, 29, 61, 78, 81, 101, 104, 228, 257
  of Ikarion 25, 61, 78, 81, 228
  of Piraeus 66–67, 72–73, 76, 80–81, 126, 146, 166, 191, 193, 210, 225, 228
  Rural 273–274
Dionysiastai 102, 105, 116, 152, 194, 261
Dionysus 112, 134, 170, 193, 263, 269, 272–274
  Demotes 270
  Eleuthereus 25, 28, 57–59, 66, 69–70, 75–76, 90, 112, 114, 117, 130, 142, 191, 215, 217, 220, 225–226, 229, 237, 242–243, 262–263
    See also Dionysia, of city
  in Limnai 122, 170
  in Piraeus 28, 50, 60, 73, 75, 80, 85, 87, 99, 104, 197, 200, 204, 209, 213, 225, 231, 244
    See also Dionysia, of Piraeus
  Lenaios 221
  of Delos 93
  of Dionysiastae 102, 116, 194
  of Eleusis 61, 78, 101, 104
  of Ikarion 25, 61, 78, 81, 286
Diopeithes 129
Dioscouroi 195–196
dokimasia 213, 239, 304
Draco 123, 305

Echelos 153
Echetlaios 155, 163, 177
Eirene 66, 143, 166
eirusione 64, 113, 117, 170
eisiteteria 4–5, 51, 62–63, 69, 72, 75–76, 78–80, 87, 96, 114, 116, 130, 143, 205, 222, 224, 226, 304
Eleusinia 68, 73–75, 79, 80–81, 94, 96, 143, 166, 205, 209, 211–212, 215, 225, 232, 299
Eleutheria of Plataea 110
enktesis 152, 155, 179, 193
Enyalios
  of Athens 60, 77, 114, 170, 219, 225, 229
  of Lindos 285
Enyo 114, 225
ephebes 5, 9, 22–24, 26, 29, 44, 47–48, 52, 58–59, 66, 71–72, 75–76, 80–82, 84–85, 92, 96–97, 104, 112–113–114, 117, 119, 130, 143, 145, 148–149, 170, 217, 220, 224–227, 236–237, 247, 251, 256, 258, 262–263, 284, 304
  See also kosmetai
Epidauria 51, 87, 230
epimeletai 3, 13, 24, 27–28, 43, 48, 57, 59, 66, 71, 81, 83, 94, 109, 210, 212–214, 217, 230, 236–237, 239, 250–251, 262–263, 304
  of Amphiaraia 25, 27, 71, 73, 131, 209, 212, 214, 244
  of Asclepius in Piraeus 71, 80, 209, 212
  of Bendis 27, 33, 48, 102, 105, 114, 152, 246–247
  of Dionysia at Acharnai 61, 151
  of Eleusinian Mysteries 21–22, 33, 43, 59, 66–67, 71–72, 80–82, 85, 87, 94, 103–104, 111, 114, 117, 133, 146, 169, 197–198, 204, 209, 212–214, 225, 227, 233, 246–247, 296–300
  of *koina* 32, 102, 105, 116, 119, 213, 236, 246, 262
  of Mother of the Gods 105
  of *pompe* of City Dionysia 24, 27, 71, 80–81, 94, 103, 114, 151, 197, 209, 212, 214, 237

epimeletai (cont.)
of Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira 57, 71, 80, 85, 209, 212
to repair dedications 34, 204
Epimenides 158–159
episkeuastai 209–210, 239
epistatai 304
of Asclepius in Piraeus 72, 80
of Eleusis 72, 80–81, 128, 133, 146, 296–298
Epitaphia 144, 219
eponymous heroes 12, 122, 141–143, 150, 154, 163, 195, 203, 206, 208, 224, 272
Erechtheus 112, 115, 117, 140, 157, 169–170, 200, 208, 272
ergastinai 26, 143, 151, 304
Erinyes 195
Eros 48
Euboulos 62
eukosmia 4, 25, 51–52, 55, 68, 135, 140, 149, 212, 222, 244, 259, 262–263
Eumenes II 290
Eumolpidae 32, 44, 50–51, 62, 71, 111, 123, 169, 200–201, 209, 218, 227, 246, 260, 298–299
eunoia 22, 31–33, 44, 72, 96, 102, 186, 188, 214, 242, 249, 282, 288, 300
Euryclides 95
eusebeia 4–7, 13, 19–47, 54–55, 58, 65, 70–71, 76, 97, 111, 118, 122, 124, 128, 138, 142, 151, 161–162, 166, 172–173, 177–178, 186, 188, 242–243, 246–247, 249–251, 255, 262–263, 276, 282–284, 287–291, 294–295, 301
euthynai 54, 123, 149, 174, 198–201, 203, 213, 215, 238–239, 304
See also priests and priestesses
exegetai 203, 305
of city 58, 72, 75, 80, 158, 225
of Eleusis 133, 296

family *See oikos*
festivals *See heortai*

Galaxia 65, 75, 79, 81, 87, 207, 225, 250, 277–278
Ganymede 263
Ge 170, 193
gene 2, 12, 93, 115–117, 119, 123, 170, 189–190, 198–203, 218, 229, 232, 239–241, 245, 305
generals *See* strategoi
grammateis 4, 65, 102, 105, 116, 119, 206, 217, 246, 305
gymnasiarchs 305
of Beroea 287
of city 42, 305
of Salamis 82, 101, 104

Hagne Thea of Delos 93
Haloa 61, 68, 78–79, 81, 98, 101, 110, 114, 117, 221, 229
Harmodius 60, 77, 141, 219, 229
health *See hygieia*
Hebe 26, 50, 74, 213
Hegemone 114, 225
Helios 4, 52, 114, 116
heortai 1–2, 6, 9–10, 12, 15, 20, 22, 24–25, 29, 37, 58, 65–67, 70–71, 73–74, 81–82, 91, 94–95, 115, 117, 122, 125–127, 131–133, 137–138, 142–148, 150, 165–168, 175–176, 186–188, 194, 202, 205, 207, 209–212, 214–216, 220, 223–237, 241, 243–244, 248, 252, 257–260, 263, 269, 273, 297, 303–306
beauty of 9–10, 24–25, 131–132, 137, 175, 179, 185–188, 202, 216, 232–233, 252, 257–260, 263–264
Hephaestus 63, 127–128, 148, 191–193, 206
Hephaisteia 24, 73–74, 127–128, 146, 209–210, 212, 214, 230, 257
Heracles 114–115, 117, 169, 196, 225, 262, 267–270
at Eleusis 53
in Acris 137
of Cynosarges 193
of Ionidae 25
of Mesogeioi 27, 50, 53, 244
Heraclidae 50
Herakleia 25, 73, 205, 209, 212
heralds *See* keryx
Hermaia 101, 104, 123, 147, 174, 193, 230
Hermes 202, 223–224
Eisagogos of Samos 287
Hegemonios 66, 156, 163, 166, 177, 221, 233

of Eleusis 78
of Erchia 61
of Salamis 75, 225
Hermocopidae 206
Heroa 51, 87
Hero Archegetes 115, 268, 272
heroes 11, 23, 89, 150, 219, 228
See also eponymous heroes
Heros Iatros 33–34, 53, 139–140, 149, 204, 220, 261
Heros Strategos 221
Hestia 114, 225
hierophant 35–36, 43, 48, 50, 53, 111, 115, 117, 138, 160, 169, 201, 238, 245–247, 298, 305
hieropoioi 3, 13, 53, 57, 63, 65–67, 73–74, 81, 83, 99, 102, 109, 118, 122, 205–206, 209–214, 230, 236, 239, 247, 250–251, 277, 281, 305
for expiatory sacrifices 73, 209, 281
for the year 73–74, 80–81, 205, 209–214
of Amphiaraus 205, 212
of Athena 211
of Bendis 27
of Boule 62, 66, 78, 205, 277
of Brauronia 205, 212
of Delia 205, 212
of demes 61, 74, 213
of Dionysus in Piraeus 73, 80–81, 85, 87, 92, 197, 200, 204, 209, 213, 244
of Eleusinia 74, 80–81, 205, 212
of Eleusis 81, 128, 146, 209, 227, 297–298
of Hebe 74, 213
of Hephaisteia 24, 27, 73–74, 127, 146, 205, 209–210, 212, 214
of Herakleia 205, 212
of *koina* 42, 86, 102, 105, 213
of Nemesis and Themis 69, 73–74, 79–80, 222
of Panathenaia 24, 26, 73, 75, 80–81, 132, 135, 147, 210–211, 213–214, 237, 256
of Pythaïs 73, 211, 216
of Semnai 73, 209, 212
of technitai of Dionysus 102, 105
of Zeus Olympios 211
hipparchs 13, 19, 68–69, 79, 87, 131, 222–224, 257, 305
Horai 4, 52, 114, 116
horistai 30
hosiotes 10, 13, 35–36, 40–41, 44, 120, 123, 150, 170, 173, 186, 188, 191, 251, 263–264, 283–293, 295, 301
hygieia 4–6, 49, 51–52, 57–58, 61, 63, 69, 72, 86–90, 98, 100–101, 114–115, 135, 140, 157–161, 197, 204, 207, 217, 242–243, 269–270, 273–274, 302
Hygieia 51, 71, 80, 87, 114, 117, 136
Hyttenios 61, 78

Iakchos 113, 117, 169, 226, 299
Iaso 202
Ikarios 286
impiety *See asebeia*
Ion 121, 232
Isis
of Piraeus 143, 193–194
of Rhamnous 31

justice *See dikaiosune*

Kalamaia 61, 78, 81, 101, 111–113, 117
kallieresis 69, 73, 76, 222, 267–268, 270, 276, 281–282
Kalliste 21, 43, 50, 53, 57, 93, 200, 246
Kallistephanos 261
Kallynteria 115, 117, 155, 163
kanephoroi 27, 98, 112, 117, 210, 256–258, 261, 305
Kerykes 50–51, 59, 71, 111, 123, 169, 200–201, 209, 218, 227, 245, 298–299
keryx 26, 110, 122, 150, 169–170, 195–196, 205
of Areopagus Council 58–60, 77–78, 136, 219
koina 1–2, 8, 19, 24, 39, 44–45, 51, 54, 57, 83, 86, 102, 114–116, 119, 123, 150–153, 176, 189, 200, 202, 205, 213, 235–237, 247, 250–251, 304–306
See also orgeones; thiasoi
Kore 162, 164
of Cnidus 285, 292–293
of Eleusis 61–62, 64, 68, 71, 78–80, 94–95, 98, 101, 104, 114, 117, 124, 128–129, 133–134, 136, 150, 160–162, 164, 169, 174, 191, 195–196, 205, 207, 214, 222, 261, 298–300

kosmetai 22–23, 58, 72, 75–76, 80–81, 84–85, 87, 90, 96–97, 104, 112, 114, 117–118, 225–226, 231, 233, 251, 284, 305
kosmos 32, 134, 147, 161, 164, 177, 209, 254, 257–263
Kourotrophos 61, 78
Kronia 25, 64–65, 79, 207, 230
kyrbeis 121, 167–168, 232, 305

laws *See nomoi*
Lenaia 59, 66–67, 72, 80–81, 113, 126, 132, 147, 166, 191, 193, 218, 232
Leos 170, 208, 232
Leto 115, 267–270
Leukophryena 290, 294–295
liturgies 23, 26, 91–92, 95, 97, 99, 133, 148, 225, 252–253
Lycurgus 67, 98, 103, 125, 132, 134, 136, 143, 161, 178, 180, 197, 211, 233, 257, 261, 297
Lysimachus, King 47

Maleates 202
manteis 73, 203, 281
megaloprepeia 42, 185–187, 252–253
metics 126, 145, 210
Moirai 61, 78
Mother of the Gods
  koinon of 21, 30–31, 51–55, 83, 101–102, 105, 153, 246–247, 251
  of city 64–65, 75, 79, 81, 130, 143, 149, 155, 163, 177, 191, 207, 211, 225–226, 250, 276–278
Musaia 123, 147, 174
Muses 13, 194
Mysteries
  at Agrai 72, 80–81, 87, 299
  at Eleusis 23, 39, 59, 72, 74–75, 80–81, 94, 111, 115, 117, 122, 126, 128–129, 133–134, 138, 141, 146, 160, 164, 169, 193, 205–206, 214, 218, 225, 227, 233, 239, 296–300, 305
    profanation of 129, 146, 201, 206, 300
    See also epimeletai

Neleus 30, 121, 128, 148
Nemesia 61, 67, 81, 97, 137, 221
Nemesis 31, 68–69, 73–74, 79, 80–81, 97–98, 103, 114, 117, 221–222
Nicomachus, the *anagrapheus* 106, 109, 121, 124, 144, 167–168, 173, 176, 191, 199, 232, 240
Nike 63, 276–278
nomoi 1, 3, 7- 8, 12, 15, 35, 62–63, 82, 109–110, 116, 120–150, 154, 156, 165, 167–170, 174–182, 186–187, 190–191, 199–200, 226–230, 239–241, 243, 261, 267, 285, 289, 296–298, 305
  of associations 151–153, 179
  of demes 151, 175
  of Solon *See* Solon
nomothesia and nomothetai 120, 29, 131–134, 147, 297, 305
Nymphe 51–52, 101
Nymphs 156, 163

oaths 39–41, 45, 119, 287
  of ephebes 114, 170, 225
oikos 11–12, 123–124, 174, 176, 189–190, 202, 205, 229, 253, 282, 288
Olympieia 166, 211, 230
omens 1, 20, 41, 69, 73, 86, 88, 177–178, 197, 201, 204, 220, 222–223, 238, 242–243, 256–257, 267–268, 270, 272–273, 276, 279–282, 301
oracles 1, 3, 20, 32, 41, 53, 63, 69, 73, 78, 86, 109, 111, 151, 154–165, 176–182, 185, 187, 204, 206, 220, 229, 243, 271, 281
  of Ammon 178
  of Amphiaraus 162–164, 177, 180–181
  of Apollo of Delphi 9, 31, 112, 115, 125–126, 129, 133, 138, 154–164, 176–181, 194, 206, 261, 267–274
  of Demetrius Poliorcetes 141–142, 150
  of Zeus of Dodona 32, 112, 126, 156, 162–164, 177–179, 261, 268–271, 274–275
orgeones 12, 83, 123, 202, 251, 305
  of Amynos, Asclepius, and Dexion 244, 247
  of Aphrodite 83, 102, 105
    Syria 83, 86, 247
  of Bendis 20, 33, 48, 74, 102, 105, 176, 179, 246–247
  of Mother of the Gods 30, 83, 101–102, 105, 246, 251, 262
  See also koina
Oschophoria 115, 117, 230, 232

Pan of Delos 231
Panakeia 202
Panathenaia 14, 24–26, 38, 70, 73–75, 80–81, 95–96, 104, 117, 125–127, 129, 132–135, 137, 143, 147, 166, 175, 187, 191, 205, 207, 210–218, 220, 222, 224, 227, 232–233, 236–237, 242, 247, 256–257, 260, 288, 303, 305
pannychides 2, 26, 48, 306
beauty of 9, 26, 257, 263
of Aglauros 4, 52
of Asclepius 26, 48, 51, 60
of Athena at Chalkeia 26
of Athena at Panathenaia 26, 132, 211, 214, 257
of Bendis 125, 179, 257
of Hebe 26
parasitoi of Heracles 115, 117, 169
paredroi 43, 59, 217–218, 298
Peitho 276–278
peplos 95, 141, 150, 204, 213–214, 233, 304
Pericles 41, 129, 192, 248, 251, 262
Phila 4–5, 52
Philip II 39–40, 131, 136, 145, 162, 197, 283
Philip V 142–143, 150, 283, 300
philotimia 5, 13, 21–33, 41–47, 54–55, 65, 91–92, 96–97, 109, 130, 185, 242–243, 245–247, 249–253, 258–260, 262–263, 288, 302
phratries 12, 74, 115–116, 170, 229, 305–306
phylarchs 69, 79, 223–224, 242, 306
piety *See eusebeia*
Pisistratus 157, 161, 164
Plerosia 61, 78, 81, 113, 230
Plouton 32, 53, 161, 164, 260, 262
Plynteria 93, 110, 115, 117, 155, 163
polemarch 13, 60, 77, 144, 167, 216, 219, 306
pollution 123, 159, 174–175, 240
pompai 1–2, 23–24, 26–28, 37, 48, 113, 127, 130–131, 148, 166–167, 185, 187–188, 192, 194, 211, 220, 222–227, 230–233, 239–240, 250, 254, 257, 262, 303, 305–306
beauty of 9, 26–28, 48, 222, 243, 254–255, 257–259, 262–263
for victory over Philip II 136, 145, 197
of Adonia 116
of Amphieraia 25, 27, 131, 212
of Aphrodite Pandemos 138, 145
of Apollo 64, 181
of Asclepieia 27, 58, 60, 171, 216
of Athena Nike 26, 225
of Athena Polias 195
of Bendis 27, 48, 102, 105, 116, 152, 179, 257
of Demeter and Kore 195
of Demetrius and Antigonus 141
of Dionysia
of Acharnai 25, 61, 151
of city 24, 27, 58, 71, 94, 103, 114, 130, 171, 212, 216–217
of Eleusis 61
of Piraeus 28, 60, 232
of Eleusinian Mysteries 113, 117, 133, 138, 146, 169, 225–226, 296–299
of Hephaisteia 74, 210, 257
of Heracles 27, 53
of Kalamaia 61, 101, 111
of Lenaia 59, 218
of Panathenaia 70, 95, 117, 132, 210, 213–214, 224, 233
of Pythaïs 259
of Semnai 113, 117, 195, 225–226
of Thargelia 58–59, 181, 216, 220
of Theseia 27, 96, 159, 233
of Twelve Gods 195
of Zeus Olympios 195
of Zeus Soter 28, 58, 60, 216
Poseidon 256
Asphaleios 63
Erechtheus 112, 117, 140, 157, 200
Hippios 69, 79, 222, 224
of Sunium 193
Pelasgios 50, 132, 147, 191
prayers 1, 6, 11, 35, 88–89, 118, 122–123, 125, 142, 150, 169, 179, 181, 190, 199–201, 204, 230–231, 237–238, 240, 243, 248, 260, 267–270, 272, 291, 300
by basileus 110, 169
by bouleutai 62, 205
by hipparch 69, 222–223
by keryx 110, 122, 150, 169–170, 196, 205
Praxiergidae 93, 110, 115, 117, 125, 149, 155, 177
priests and priestesses 1–3, 5–6, 9, 12, 15, 19, 37, 47–48, 50–61, 74, 83, 90, 92–93, 105, 109, 118, 124, 135–136, 140, 142, 170, 175, 189, 191, 193, 198–203, 208, 211, 218, 227, 230–233, 236–241, 247, 251, 263, 282

priests and priestesses (cont.)
euthynai of 54, 123, 149, 174, 198–203, 213, 238
of Aglauros 4–5, 43, 50, 52–54, 57, 82, 85, 87, 90, 114, 116, 197, 204, 251
of Ammon 50
of Amphiaraus 50–54, 85, 114, 116, 197, 204
of Aphrodite Pandemos 260
of Aphrodite Syria 51, 86, 114, 251
of Apollo 33, 52, 58–60, 219
of Apollo Erithaseos 52, 139
of Apollo Pythios 82
of Apollo Zoster 31, 48, 50, 52–55, 112, 117
of Artemis of Oinoe 232
of Asclepius 162
in city 14, 19, 21, 26, 29–30, 33, 43–44, 50–52, 54–57, 82, 84–87, 90, 92–93, 114, 117, 130–131, 135, 140, 149, 171, 197, 200–201, 204, 238, 244, 246, 256, 262
in Piraeus 52, 71, 136, 202, 213
of Athena Nike 124–125, 128, 139, 149, 198–199
of Athena Polias 29–30, 43–44, 50, 53–55, 57, 85, 87, 90, 92–93, 104, 109–110, 112, 125, 131, 135, 140, 149, 197, 199–200, 203–204, 235, 246–247, 251
of Bendis 125, 152, 179
of Demeter at Eleusis 43, 50, 111, 199–200, 238, 300
of Demos and Charites 58, 72, 75, 80, 225
of Diomus 50
of Dionysus 237
of Dionysus in Piraeus 50, 73, 85, 87, 197, 200, 204, 213
of eponymous heroes 154, 203
of Erechtheus and Poseidon 112, 117, 140, 200
of Hebe and Alcmene at Aixone 50
of Heracles
at Eleusis 53
of Ionidai 25
of Mesogeioi 27, 50, 53
of Heraclidae at Aixone 50
of Heros Iatros 33–34, 53, 204, 261
of Kalliste 21, 43, 50, 53, 57, 93, 200, 246
of Mother of the Gods 30, 51–53, 55, 101, 105, 153, 155, 251
of Nymphe 51–52, 101
of Poseidon Pelasgios 50
of Syrian Aphrodite 51, 86, 114
of Theoi Megaloi 51, 55
of Thesmophoroi at Melite 19, 50, 52, 82, 100–101, 104
of Zeus Soter of city 21, 43, 50, 57, 71, 85, 87, 90, 93, 197, 204
of Zeus Soter of Piraeus 71, 85, 197
processions *See pompai*
proedria 12, 245, 306
Proerosia 23–24, 117, 225, 230
prytaneis 19–22, 26, 43, 48, 57, 62–66, 78–79, 81–88, 90, 96, 99, 113, 117, 130, 135–138, 145, 170, 197, 202, 204, 207–208, 218, 226–230, 233, 237, 247, 249–251, 274, 277–278, 298, 306
psephismata 1, 3, 8, 12, 15, 109–110, 115, 120–151, 154–158, 161, 165–168, 172, 174–182, 187, 190–191, 194–195, 198–199, 202, 204–206, 220, 226–230, 234, 239–240, 243, 267, 296–297, 300, 306
of *koina* 151–153
of demes 151, 175
Ptolemaia 98–99, 103, 138, 147, 197
Ptolemy III 142–143, 150, 197, 295
Ptolemy VI 290
purification 159, 161–162, 164, 172, 205
Pythaïdes 15, 48, 55, 93, 96–97, 99, 104, 113, 138, 147, 157, 163, 177, 181, 194, 211, 216, 219, 231, 234, 259, 263
Pythia 113, 117, 205

religious associations, private *See koina*
Roma of Delos 93
Romaia 74
ruler cult
See Alexander; Antigonus Monophthalmos; Demetrius Poliorcetes; Antigonus Gonatas

sacrifice 1–3, 5–7, 9, 11–12, 19–26, 34–37, 39, 41–45, 47–48, 52, 55–106, 109–119, 121–122, 124–125, 135–137, 141–142, 144–153, 156, 158, 165–175, 178, 185–188, 190–192, 194–197, 199, 201–204, 207–208, 213, 217–218, 226–228, 230–240, 243–244, 247–250, 252, 272–273, 279–282, 288, 291, 301

beauty of 5–6, 9, 19–22, 35, 37, 88, 92, 132, 137, 181, 188, 242–243, 255–257, 260, 263–264, 279–280
"thank you" 70–71, 73, 244
safety *See soteria*
Salaminioi 115, 118–119, 121, 232, 236
sanctuaries 1–2, 11–12, 30–34, 37, 39, 45, 47–48, 51–53, 62, 78, 91, 100, 111, 127–128, 134–135, 138–142, 144, 148–150, 161–165, 171, 176, 178, 182, 192, 195, 203, 205, 218, 224, 228, 230–231, 250, 283, 292–293, 300–301, 306
beauty of 9, 31–34, 48, 99, 101–105, 139, 196, 243, 260–264
boundaries of 30, 45, 127–128, 138, 148, 175, 193–194, 218, 229
care and repair of 1–2, 31, 34, 52–54, 97, 99, 101–105, 131, 135, 139, 152, 197, 209–210, 221, 231, 236, 252
restrictions concerning 52, 119, 123–124, 127, 129, 137, 139, 142, 148–151, 174–175, 240, 269, 300
Sarapis
at Rhamnous 31, 98, 221
of Delos 93, 231
Sarapiastai 22, 42, 44, 105, 246–247
Seleucus I 294
Seleucus II 295
Semnai 24, 73–75, 81, 113, 117, 170, 195–196, 209, 212, 225–226
Sinuri of Caria 287
sitesis 244
Skira 113, 117, 230
Solon 173, 247, 296
calendar of 15, 106, 109, 121, 128, 144, 167–173, 176, 191–192, 232, 240
nomoi of 15, 121–124, 128, 133, 144–151, 167–172, 174–176, 202, 217, 240–241, 267, 298, 305
sophronistai 26
Soteres
Demetrius and Antigonus 64, 79, 136, 141, 150, 197
See also Zeus Soter; Athena Soteira
soteria 4–6, 33–34, 46, 49, 51–52, 57–58, 61, 63, 69, 72, 86–90, 94, 98, 100–101, 135, 137, 157, 192, 197, 204, 207, 217, 242–243, 274, 299, 302
Soteria at Delphi 28, 138, 147, 294
statues 70, 138, 175, 178, 198, 244–245
beauty of 10, 32–33, 48, 53, 162, 164, 260–261, 263–264
dedications at Delphi 195
dedications on Delos 231
of Antigonus Gonatas 286
of Aphrodite Pandemos 138, 260–261
of Apollo Alexikakos 160–161
of Apollo Patroös 103, 164
of Artemis Brauronia 134, 149
of Athena Nike 98, 139, 149, 192, 204, 209, 261
of Athena Parthenos 139, 192, 194, 209
of Athena Promachos 194–195
of Bendis 125, 179
of Chrysis 55
of Demeter and Kore 300
of Demetrius and Antigonus 141–142
of Dione at Dodona 32–33, 48, 162, 164, 177, 261, 263
of Dionysus of Dionysiastae 102
of Harmodius and Aristogiton 141
of Zeus at Olympia 163
Stenia 64, 79, 82, 207, 230
strategoi 306
of garrisons 13, 31, 44, 47, 67–69, 73–74, 79–81, 85, 97–98, 103–105, 114, 220–224, 227–228, 233–235
of polis 13, 44, 47, 59, 62–63, 65–68, 71–73, 77–79, 81–82, 84, 97–98, 136, 156, 181, 197, 204, 217, 220–223, 228, 234, 251, 253, 257
sphagia 280
syllogeis 44, 66, 211

tables, adornment of 29–30, 262
beauty of 29–30, 262
for Agathe Thea 30
for Aglauros 4, 52–53, 262
for Asclepius 29–30, 51, 60, 262
for Athena Polias 29–30, 53, 109, 112, 117, 262
for Heracles 262
for Plouton 53, 161, 164, 262
for Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira 212, 262
tamiai 83, 230, 236, 294, 306
of Apollo 33
of Apollo Lykeios 205

tamiai (cont.)
of Archarnai 25, 61, 151
of Athena 106, 139, 148, 192, 209, 285
of Boule 60, 63, 65, 77–78, 106, 136, 158, 181, 206
of Dionysiastae 102, 105
of Halai Aixonides 61
of Mother of the Gods 102, 105, 205, 246
of prytaneis 24, 43, 65, 78, 82, 99, 103, 106, 207, 235, 238
of Rhamnous 61, 228
of Sarapiastae 246
of "the other gods" 148, 192, 209, 285
of sitiotic fund 60, 63, 77, 136, 206
of stratiotic fund 60, 78, 106, 205
of Zeus Labraundos 32, 55, 102, 105
taxiarchs 44, 66, 68, 74, 79–80, 98, 103, 220, 222–223, 262, 306
Technitai of Dionysus 38, 45, 102, 105, 234, 259, 290, 294–295
temples 32, 83, 100, 178, 194, 196, 230, 239, 260
beauty of 260–261, 263–264
of Amphiaraus 163, 180
of Aphrodite Pandemos 260
of Apollo of Delphi 260
of Apollo Patroös 160
of Artemis Brauronia 134
of Asclepius in city 140
of Asclepius at Sunium 98, 104, 221
of Athena Nike 128, 148–149, 204–205, 260
of Athena Polias 194, 214
of Dionysiastae 102, 261
of Dionysus Eleuthereus 262
on Delos 231
Thallo 114, 225
Thargelia 58–59, 66, 77, 82, 95, 126–127, 137, 148, 181, 191, 193, 216–217, 220, 230, 232
Themis 68, 73–74, 79, 97, 114, 117, 221
Themistocles 13, 66, 194
Theoi Megaloi
in Athens 51, 55, 75, 81, 152–153, 225, 295
on Delos 231
Theonidai 51
theoriai 47, 113, 141, 175, 194, 247, 306
beauty of 10, 48, 258–260, 263
to Athens
from Miletus 25, 246
from Priene 25
to Basileia 68
to Delos *See* Delia
to Delphi *See* Pythaïdes and Pythia
to Demetrius 141
to Dodona 162, 194, 270, 274
to Nemea 194
to Olympia 205, 252, 258–259
to Ptolemaia *See* Ptolemaia
to Siwa 166
to Thespiae 84, 87
Theseia 27, 29, 47, 64, 70, 74, 80, 82, 96, 104, 111, 117, 130, 138, 148, 166, 169, 207, 210–211, 215, 226, 233–235
Theseus 64, 70, 79–80, 96, 111, 117, 159, 164, 169, 177, 191, 193, 207, 211, 230, 272
Thesmophoria 124
of Cnidus 293
of Piraeus 113, 117, 139, 228
Thesmophoroi of Melite 19, 50, 52, 82, 100–101, 104
thesmothetai 58–60, 77–78, 136, 219, 306
thiasoi and thiasotai 123, 202, 251, 306
of Agathe Thea 30, 42, 72, 101, 105, 246
of Ammon 31
of Aphrodite 114, 247
of Aphrodite Ourania 116, 143
of Artemis 102, 152–153, 247
of Bendis 114, 179
of Mother of the Gods 31, 53, 251
of Tynaros 247
of Zeus Labraundos 32, 55, 102, 105, 152, 247
See also koina
treasurers *See* tamiai
tribes 1–2, 7, 12, 45–46, 57, 94, 96, 109, 127, 141–143, 150, 154, 162–163, 180, 194, 202–203, 208–211, 213, 222, 224, 229, 244, 250, 300, 303, 305, 306
trierarchs 69, 79, 98, 104, 246, 306
Triptolemus 62
trittyarchs 65
Tritopatores 61, 78
Twelve Gods 193, 195–196, 206
Tynaros 247

Zeus 61–62, 64–65, 78–79, 195, 207, 225, 256, 280
Boulaios 62, 205
Eleutherios of Termessus 285
Hypatos 267, 268–270, 272
Ktesios 64–65, 79, 113, 117, 207, 270, 275
Kynthios of Delos 93, 231
Labraundos 32, 48, 55, 102, 105, 152–153, 247
Naios of Dodona 32, 112, 126, 156, 162–164, 177–179, 194, 261, 268–271, 274–275
of Nemea 194
Olympios
of Athens 74, 134, 170, 193, 195–196, 211, 261
of Olympia 163, 286
Pankrates 63
Polieus 193, 236
Soter
of city 58, 64–65, 71, 75, 79–81, 85, 122, 134, 207, 209, 212, 216, 225, 229, 260–262, 276–278
See also priests and priestesses
of Piraeus 28, 60, 71, 80, 85, 166, 197, 229
of Rhamnous 68–69, 79, 98, 104, 221
Tropaios 75–76, 80, 225